

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

**Vol. XII.**

**Chairman, Editorial Board: HIS GRACE THE  
ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.**

**SEPT.**

**No. 3**

**Editor: Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.**

**1936**

**Assistant Editor: The Very Rev. J. M. T.  
BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.**

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MASS AND BENEDICTION.** By the  
Right Rev. ANSCAR VONIER, O.S.B., Abbot of Buckfast.

**THE REFORMERS AND THE MASS.** Dr. Messenger's New Study. By  
the Rev. ANDREW BECK, A.A.

**USURY AND PROFIT-EARNING.** By the Rev. DOM J. B.  
McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B. I. Using Wealth to Make More Wealth.  
II. Where the Bankers Come In. III. The Mutuum Contract. IV. The  
Dividing Line. V. Extrinsic Title of Lucrum Cessans.

**A CODE OF CATHOLIC ACTION.** By the Rev. HERBERT KELDANY.

For other Features and Full Contents, see page iv.

**THE UNIVERSE**

184, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Monthly: £1 or 5 dollars per year post free.

READERS' RECORD  
PLEASE DO NOT  
PRIVATE RECORD

**BURNS OATES**

*PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE*

---

**PRAYER BOOKS — MISSALS  
GENERAL CATHOLIC LITERATURE**

*Theology, Philosophy, Hagiology, Biography, Fiction,  
and Belles Lettres*

**THE PREMIER HOUSE FOR  
CHURCH FURNITURE  
CARVED WOOD-WORK  
BRASS & SILVER WARE  
STATUES & PICTURES**

---

**DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES  
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION**

---

*Catalogues, post free, to any address*

---

**BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE Ltd.**

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

*And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin.*







# THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Chairman of the Editorial Board :  
HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor :  
THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor :  
THE VERY REV. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.

VOLUME XII, No. 3.

SEPTEMBER, 1936.

## Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"  
(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)  
184, Strand, London, W.C.2

# THE UNIVERSE

THE MOST WIDELY-READ  
CATHOLIC PAPER

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

The clergy will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

The clergy will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

¶ Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other Catholic papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland.

TWOPENCE WEEKLY.

By Post, 12s. 6d. per year.

184, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

## BOOKS RECEIVED

A SIMPLE INTRODUCTION TO PLAINSONG, being a reprint of the Rules for Interpretation given in the *Liber usualis*. (Tournai: Desclee & Co. 42 pp. Belga 1. Liverpool: Rushworth & Dreaper. 1s.)

THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S, by Fr. Dunstan, O.S.F.C. (London: Alexander Ouseley, Ltd. 189 pp. 3s. 6d.)

VALIANT WOMEN, by George Goyau. (London: Sheed & Ward, Ltd. 314 pp. 6s.)

SENSE AND THOUGHT, by Greta Hort, M.A., Ph.D. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 262 pp. 8s. 6d.)

SEX IN RELIGION, by G. Simpson Marr, M.A. (Hons.), M.B., Ch.B., B.D., D.Litt. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 285 pp. 7s. 6d.)

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, by Rev. John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L. (London: Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd. 233 pp. 8s. 6d.)

THE SECRET OF CHILDHOOD, by Maria Montessori. (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 279 pp. 7s. 6d.)

REALITY AND THE MIND (Epistemology), by Celestine N. Bittle, O.M.Cap. (Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd. xii, 390 pp. 10s.)

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. The New Testament, Vol. II., The Gospel According to St. John, and The Acts of the Apostles. (Longmans. lxxviii, 334 pp. 10s. 6d.)

CARILLONS DE LOURDES, by René Gaell. (Téqui. 210 pp. 12 frs. 50.)

WAS WURDE CHRISTUS TUN? by Henri Bremond. Translated by Rudolf von der Wehd und Helmut Bockman. (Herder, Freiburg & Breisgau. xiv, 312 pp. 2 marks 80. Bound, 3 marks 80.)

DAS MENSCHLICHE IN DER KIRCHE CHRISTI, by Dr. Paul Simon. (Herder, Freiburg & Breisgau. 200 pp. 2 marks 80. Bound, 4 marks.)

# CONTENTS

SEPTEMBER, 1936

## ARTICLES :—

PAGE

1. The Relationship Between Mass and Benediction,  
By the Rt. Rev. ANSCAR VONIER, O.S.B., Abbot  
of Buckfast . . . . . 173
2. The Reformers and the Mass, Dr. Messenger's New Study,  
By the Rev. ANDREW BECK, A.A. . . . . 190
3. Usury and Profit Earning : I. Using Wealth to Make More  
Wealth; II. Where the Bankers Come In; III. The Mutuum  
Contract; IV. The Dividing Line; V. Extrinsic Title of  
Lucrum Cessans,  
By the Rev. DOM J. B. McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B. . . . . 201
4. A Code of Catholic Action,  
By the Rev. HERBERT KELDANY . . . . . 216

HOMILETICS . . . . . 221

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK :—

- I. Ascetical and Mystical Theology,  
By the Rev. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A. . . . . 229
- II. Liturgy,  
By the Very Rev. CONSULTOR J. M. T. BARTON, D.D.,  
L.S.Scr. . . . . 233
- III. History,  
By the Rev. PHILIP HUGHES, L.S.Hist . . . . . 237

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :—

- (1) May Devotions . . . . . 245
  - (2) Refusal of Absolution . . . . . 245
  - (3) Shortened Tenebrae . . . . . 246
- By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS :—

By the Very Rev. Mgr. J. Moss, D.D. . . . . 247

BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . 252

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD . . . . . 255

## THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD :—

Central Europe,  
By C. F. MELVILLE . . . . . 258

CORRESPONDENCE . . . . . 260

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

## THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MASS AND BENEDICTION

BY THE RT. REV. ANSCAR VONIER, O.S.B.,  
Abbot of Buckfast.

**T**HIS article is not an attempt to contribute something towards the theology of the Sacrifice of Mass. It is an effort to find a strictly theological setting for the orthodox devotional attitude of the Catholic people towards the Eucharist, as it manifests itself practically, both in the past and at the present time. It is my desire to show how Catholic life in its various manifestations of Eucharistic love never departs from the strictest dogmatic rules.

There is no branch of Catholic theology wherein one should walk more warily than in statements concerning the ways in which the Christian people have dealt in practice with the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Many a surprise awaits the explorer who is on the lookout for the manifestations of Catholic piety toward the divine Eucharist; generalizations are usually imprudent because there are constant exceptions to the rule. The ways of speaking of the Eucharist are as varied as the expressions of devotion, and it is never wise to build any special theory on quotations from the past, however numerous or however emphatic. The Eucharist is of all the Sacraments the richest in its Content, and as long as a devotional expression is in harmony with that Content it is not only beautiful but orthodox. The dogmatic statement of the Eucharistic faith is, of course, clear and strictly defined, but a dogmatic formula cannot prevent an endless variety of practical application when the dogma itself presents to us an object of infinite wealth, as is the case with the Eucharist. So we speak quite rightly of the developments which have taken

place in the manifestations of the faith in that greatest of all mysteries outside the Trinity, during the centuries of the Christian Church.

In the case of the Eucharist, more than with any other of the Sacraments, there is precisely this feature, the Content of the Sacrament: what is in the Sacrament. With the other Sacraments we speak of their power; in this one, before the question of the power there is the matter of its Content. Our Catechism tells us that the Sacrament contains the Body and Blood of Christ: that it contains the Body under the appearance of bread, the Blood under the appearance of wine, and then again both Body and Blood in either of the species: that it contains, both under the appearance of bread and under the appearance of wine, the Soul and Divinity of Christ, in fact, the whole Person of Christ; and, as a consequence, the whole Trinity, as one Person cannot be separated from another. This mystery of "containing" is expressed with a qualification: it is said that Body and Blood are in the Sacrament in virtue of Transubstantiation; that the Soul and the Divinity are in the Sacrament in virtue of concomitance.

Even a superficial grasp of this dogma of "containing" ought to prepare one for all possible manifestations of practical response on the part of the faithful to so wonderful a possession. On the other hand, with all this wealth of reality there is a specialization. The Christian people must remember first that the Eucharist is one of the seven Sacraments, that it is a divine Reality and a divine Power under the visible signs of bread and wine: at no time is the divine Presence in the Eucharist detachable from the external signs, from the matter and form of the Sacrament. And though it is Christian faith to say that the Son of God is in the Eucharist, His way and His mode of existence therein are infinitely mysterious; they are in fact different from that mode of existence which He has now in heaven and which is His natural mode of existence.

Secondly, the Eucharist comes to us under the aspect of a Sacrifice; that is its primary aspect. As such it was instituted by Christ, as such it remains with us, because there is no Eucharistic Presence except through the words of Consecration, and the words of the Consecration are the formula of the Sacrifice. But it is a

Sacrifice that invariably terminates in a banquet, so that one cannot think of the Eucharist without this consummation: it is eaten and it is drunk. It has no other termination; that is its natural ending as the Consecration is its natural beginning. The Eucharistic mystery ceases to be present through this act of assimilation in the way of a supernatural food and beverage; the Bread that is broken must be eaten, the Cup that is blessed must be drunk: for this end they are given to us. One might almost say that the Christian people can do anything with the Eucharist provided they grasp the fact that it is one of the Sacraments, and that it is the Body and Blood of Christ offered up to God as a perfect Holocaust, containing in a superabundant measure the perfection of all sacrifice.

The impression exists in some minds that in the later centuries of the Church the devotion to the Eucharist has become eccentric. I take the word eccentric here in its geometrical sense, as implying a movement that is no longer centripetal. Much of our modern devotion to the Blessed Sacrament is suspected by some to have hardly any present relationship with that central significance of the Eucharist, the Sacrifice. We seem to carry about the mystery of the Body and the Blood of Christ with such freedom that it becomes difficult to see any link between various modern modes of worship of the Eucharist and the sober and central fact of the Sacrifice. The title of my paper, *The Relationship Between Mass and Benediction*, meets that problem. We may call Benediction the most eccentric manifestation of the Eucharistic faith, whilst the Mass is the most concentric. But the purpose of this article is to show that in reality there is no such centrifugal movement in the Eucharistic worship of the people of God; all the acts of worship that we see and hear are mere radiations from the central seat of life and light.

In its first manifestation at the Last Supper the Eucharistic mystery presents itself to us with extreme simplicity. I do not say that the Last Supper was a very simple celebration: it was indeed an elaborate ritual; Christ celebrated the Passover with all the traditional solemnity, and He added to that ceremony His own wonderful rite of washing the feet of the Apostles. But in the midst of that rich setting He spoke



words, and performed and commanded an action of extreme simplicity: the institution of the Eucharist. He spoke the words that changed bread into His Body and wine into His Blood, and commanded the disciples to eat and to drink. The eating and the drinking followed directly upon the words of Consecration and it would appear that the divine Bread was eaten before the Cup was blessed. So immediately do those two actions, blessing and partaking, in other words, consecrating and communicating, follow upon one another, that the Gospel of St. Mark actually puts the words of the consecration of the Cup after the drinking of it: "And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them. And they all drank of it. And he said to them: This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many."<sup>1</sup>

When we speak of developments in the Eucharistic liturgy we do not mean precisely all those solemnities that went before or came after the sacramental act. The early Christians, like Christ Himself, celebrated the Eucharist in the midst of other religious functions; they assembled to pray, to preach, to prophesy, to exhort, and for all the other acts of their new worship. In the midst of that activity the strictly sacramental rite took place, in that simplicity which it had at the Last Supper when Christ Himself was the Celebrant. Yet a development is soon noticeable, and a development which we may call strictly sacramental. It is this: the interval between the words of blessing or consecration and the act of eating or communicating became more and more noticeable. The consecrated Elements remained for some time before they were partaken of by the celebrant and the faithful, and whilst they remained appropriate worship was carried on in their presence, a worship either directly concerned with the divine Elements or of a general order. The oldest liturgies we possess already contain that departure from the mode of the Last Supper, an interposition of time between the consecration and the communicating.

There is first the interval between Consecration and Communion for the priest: there is no law that limits this interval. Theoretically speaking Mass might be

<sup>1</sup> Mark xiv. 23, 24.

hours longer than it is; prayers inserted between the Elevation and the Communion might be more numerous and much more varied than they are in any of the recognized liturgies; this would in no wise interfere with the oneness of Mass. That the faithful who are not celebrants in the ministerial sense should partake of the consecrated Elements belongs to the substance of the Eucharistic mystery. The Apostles were not celebrants nor even co-celebrants with Christ at the Last Supper; they were in the position of the ordinary faithful. But it soon becomes evident in the history of the Church that the interval between Consecration and the Communion of the faithful was allowed to be much more considerable than with the celebrant himself. The faithful could be communicated in their own homes, at great distances from the altar where Mass had been said; still there could never be any doubt that there was an essential relationship between the Communion of the faithful and the Sacrifice offered up by the priest. It was always the sacrificial banquet, it could never be anything else. It is not possible for the Christian to receive at Holy Communion anything that is not the sacrificial banquet, though he may be communicated many days after the celebration of the Mass. The Bread and the Wine were kept for him.

This extension then, both in time and space, between Consecration and Communion is what we may call the first and most far-reaching development in the Church's treatment of the Eucharist. There is really no other development of an objective nature; there are subjective expansions or enlargements of the piety of the faithful with regard to the Eucharist, but, speaking sacramentally, as an external and official mode of administering this divine legacy of the Eucharist the Church has taken one liberty only—she separates Communion from Consecration, she takes away the holy Food and the holy Drink from the altar of the Sacrifice for a distant and a retarded consummation of the banquet. No doubt Christ Himself taught the Apostles the manner of this liberty, but at no time did the Church admit any other ending to the Eucharistic celebration than an eating of the Bread and a drinking of the Cup.

How, then, does she fill up the interval between the two acts, now that she is in possession of her Lord and

of her God? The Church's behaviour with the consecrated Elements before the eating and the drinking is a wonderful chapter in her life; there is simply no telling what she may not do. Once the Church had found out that she could keep the Eucharist for a while she understood that there was no limit to her freedom. All we see to-day in Eucharistic devotion is only a variety of this primitive liberty. There is truly no essential difference between the prayers and the rites that fill, in the Canon of the Roman Mass, the space between the Consecration and the Communion of the priest and the triumphant procession of the Eucharistic Congress at Dublin. The Church makes use of her privilege of keeping her Eucharistic Christ for a while. Benediction in all its varieties is merely this, the glorifying of the divine Gift before it is eaten and drunk, for it is only for that final act of partaking that it is reserved; it has no existence, so to speak, except as an expectation of that ultimate eating and drinking.

When I compare the service of Benediction with the rites and prayers that fill the Canon of the Mass, between the Consecration and the Communion of the priest, I am not guilty of rashness. Whatever has been inserted in that interval is of ecclesiastical origin; however wonderful and venerable it may be, it does not belong to the essence of the Eucharistic mystery, it could be altered, it could be amplified, it could be omitted without interfering with the substance of Things. It is, in other words, the most authentic instance of the Church's own way with her Eucharistic Lord between the divine conversion of the elements and their eating and drinking, between the Sacrifice and the sacrificial Banquet.

In the theology of the Sacrifice of the Mass the question is raised whether the priest's Communion at Mass is an integral part of the Sacrifice itself, whether there would be no Sacrifice if the priest did not communicate. The more common opinion is that the Sacrifice is found completely in the Consecration. However as the Eucharist is a sacrificial banquet, partaking belongs to the Eucharistic rites. It is not clear, however, that there is a difference of kind between the Communion of the priest and the Communion of the faithful, either at Mass or outside Mass: the difference is only accidental. The aspect of divine banqueting, of the repast that

follows the immolation in the divine Sacrifice is indeed brought out more clearly by the priest's Communion. But in reality, through the intrinsic qualities of the Eucharist, every Communion, received anywhere, has the same signification, it is a feasting on the immolated Victim. Whether the faithful attend to the circumstance or not, does not matter; this feature is of divine institution and cannot be suppressed.

We may, therefore, look upon the words and acts of the priest at the altar, between the Consecration and the Communion, as being the prototype of all that worship of the Eucharist which is commonly called *extra-sacramentum*. It is, of course, not *extra-sacramentum* but only *extra-missam*, taking Mass in its limited sense, as a definite rite with a beginning and a conclusion. After the Consecration the celebrant is not uninterruptedly busy with the sacro-sanct Elements that are on the altar either in prayer or in action. The three prayers, *Unde et memores*, *Supra quae*, and *Supplices*, have a direct relationship with the Eucharistic Elements that are upon the altar; the Little Elevation, as it is called, the breaking of the Host into the chalice and the prayers immediately preceding the Communion of the priest are also immediate Eucharistic acts; the other prayers and invocations, the *Pater*, the *Libera nos*, the *Agnus Dei*, the prayer for peace, are not directly Eucharistic.

This mingling of the professedly Eucharistic invocations with more general acts of Christian spirituality is typical of all Eucharistic worship. With the Blessed Sacrament exposed we attend to the mystery in intermittent fashion only. We say other prayers, we sing the litanies of the Saints or of our Lady; we recite the Rosary; in fact, we behave as we might if the Eucharist were not present. This has been the liberty of the Church at all times. The specific Eucharistic act is generally short, such as the chanting of the *Tantum ergo* and the act of blessing with the divine Sacrament.

It is then my conclusion that all the modern Eucharistic worship which we call *extra-missam* is so only in a very relative sense; it is certainly never *extra-sacramentum*, because the banquet is always the end; the Blessed Sacrament exposed at Benediction will be eaten as the Eucharistic Elements on the altar at Mass are eaten.

We never omit the banqueting, we only prolong its consummation; fundamentally there is no true difference between Benediction and Mass as far as the treatment of the consecrated Elements is concerned, because the reserved Species is in the same condition as the consecrated Elements on the altar after Transubstantiation has taken place. We ought not to contrast Benediction with Mass, just as we do not contrast the Communion of the sick outside the church with Mass; they are merely different aspects of one and the same mystery, the divine banquet.

In order to bring out more clearly this intrinsic cohesion of the blessed Eucharist outside Mass with the Sacrifice of the new Law we might consider for a moment the Church's treatment of the consecrated Bread on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday. It is not my intention to discuss the origin and the antiquity of those special rites, nor is it in my mind to say that in them we have Catholic liturgy at its best and purest. I am content for my purpose with the fact that for many centuries now the Roman Church has used those ceremonies and they have acquired as much stability as any other rite in the liturgical cycle of the Latin Church.

We see then that at the solemn Mass of Maundy Thursday a special Host is consecrated and put apart in a sacred vessel. At the end of the Mass the Host is carried in solemn procession to what we call the Altar of Repose. There, for a whole day and a whole night, wherever it can be done, unceasing worship is paid to the consecrated Element of Bread. On Good Friday morning the Host is fetched back, again with great solemnity, to the altar whereon it was consecrated, and, after various rites which have all the appearance of a Mass, the sacred Host is consumed by the celebrant; this celebrant may or may not be the same person who consecrated at the Maundy Thursday Mass. In this rite we see with what solemnity the consecrated Host that was on the Altar of Repose is consumed by the priest. There is on this occasion an evident emphasis of the fact that the consecrated Bread that had been reposed had to be eaten as something coming from the Sacrifice of the previous day.

What the Latin Church does on Good Friday she might

do more frequently; she might act in that way with every particle of the divine Bread which she has reserved for several days. As a rule there is no such extra emphasis laid on the act of eating the Bread; the priest, as we say in ordinary parlance, consumes the sacred Species whenever it is time to do so; but here again the differences are merely accidental and external: intrinsically it is always a great and holy deed when the priest eats the Lord's Body which has been kept for the use of the faithful.

Certain phrases have the power to confuse theological issues. Thus we speak commonly of "consuming the sacred Species," the Host which for some time has been used for the Benediction ceremony. The words might give the impression that this "consuming" is something different from the essential act of eating and drinking. Of course, it is not. It is simply Communion in the ordinary sense.

Another deceptive phrase is this, that one says Mass in order to consecrate, either for the sick or for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. Evidently no priest consecrates for such an end; whatever his intentions may be he can do only one thing—offer up the Sacrifice of the New Testament, which Sacrifice gives to the Church the Body and Blood of her Lord.

In the same line of thought, it is not without *à propos* to remark that the Sacrifice is celebrated with all the bread and all the wine that is actually on the altar while Mass is going on. The Hosts in the Ciborium which will presently be placed in the Tabernacle, or the Host which will be put into the lunette for the evening Exposition, are not consecrated otherwise than the main Host of the Mass; they are the one, undivided Element of the Sacrifice. It is only through the power of the Sacrifice that they are changed into the Body of Christ; they are not changed directly for Communion or for worship but for the Sacrifice. These things, of course, are elementary truths in Eucharistic theology, but in a way they may be ignored on account of the insistence of the secondary intention, I mean the necessity of reserving the sacred Species for Communion and for worship. In reality, however, wherever the consecrated Host may be, It is the divine Remainder of the Sacrifice,



It has no other status, It is truly the *Salutaris Hostia*, the health-giving Victim, whether It be on the altar or in the Tabernacle. Benediction is not given with a Eucharist that is not part of the Element of the Sacrifice. If the rite of Benediction were, as it easily might be, a portion of the Canon of the Mass after the Consecration,<sup>1</sup> the difference between this rite at the morning Mass and the evening Benediction would be nil: on both occasions the consecrated Element would be used for the blessing. The words which are employed in the Canon over the consecrated Bread, *Hostia pura, Hostia sancta, Hostia immaculata*, could be pronounced over the Host in the Monstrance.

A further rectification, if I may use so strong a word, might find a place here about ordinary speech with reference to the Communion of the laity at Mass. Much is said concerning the appropriateness of the laity communicating at the Mass at which they assist. I would be the very last person to discourage the liturgists in their exhortations. Still even in this matter there is the essential aspect and the accidental aspect. In the present rite of the Latin Church—to confine ourselves to what is familiar to us—no lay person communicates during the Sacrifice of Mass but only when the Sacrifice is completed. In the broadest sense, the Sacrifice concludes with the Communion of the priest. As the laity are always communicated after the Priest's Communion it is evident that their Communion is outside the Sacrifice, though it may be said to take place at Mass, in the sense in which anything that takes place after the Priest's Communion is said to be part of Mass. The latitude of this formula "communicating at Mass" becomes more obvious on certain great occasions, and let it be said here, the great occasions are our best instructors in these matters.

I give this well-known and beautiful instance: at Christmas, at the Midnight Mass in the spacious cathedrals with their large congregations, it has become customary after the Communion of the officiating pontiff to entrust the distribution of Holy Communion to the

<sup>1</sup> The rite is found in many of the Eastern liturgies, and, even in the West, the blessing of the communicant with the Host before administration is a Benediction rite in miniature.



faithful to the charge of one or two priests who are not even ministers at the altar. The celebrant generally gives Holy Communion to his immediate assistants who are not yet priests themselves, then he goes on with the Mass and usually pontificates at Lauds; and all that time there is the beautiful spectacle of the crowds of the dear Catholic people coming to the altar rails whilst the long and solemn office of Lauds is being sung by the choir. All those good folk will certainly say, and rightly so, that they received Holy Communion at the Midnight Mass, though there was no celebrant at the altar any longer. Such instances bring home to us that the expression "communicating at Mass" must be taken in a broad sense. To receive Holy Communion at the Mass at which one assists has certainly this advantage, that it enables the faithful to enter with more understanding and ritual realism into the whole meaning of Mass; their co-celebration with the priest is more evident. Of course, this was brought out much more forcibly in the early Church when the faithful were allowed to bring their own bread and wine for the Sacrifice. This I have seen renewed in religious communities and it greatly edified me.

I use here the word co-celebration in a sense which will be easily understood and not misjudged. There is the co-celebration of several priests saying Mass together, as in the Eastern rite. There is again the co-celebration of the newly-ordained priest with the Bishop at the Ordination Mass in the Latin rite. These are co-celebrations in the whole meaning, but, as we all know and as liturgists never cease to repeat—and the more they do it the better for us—there is also that share of every one of the faithful in the celebration of Mass which is expressed in the words: "*Orate fratres ut meum et vestrum sacrificium fiat acceptabile.*" I say then that Communion at Mass, that is to say Communion directly after the conclusion of the Sacrifice, brings home the spirit of co-celebration as nothing else will. But the Catholic who, instead of receiving Holy Communion at the Midnight Mass returns to the Cathedral on the morning of Christmas Day, and receives Holy Communion outside any Mass, is not on this account any more distant in essentials from the Sacrifice in which was consecrated the Bread which he consumes.

There is another consideration which I might venture to call a correction of much haphazard language; it has to do with the permanence of Christ's Eucharistic Presence in the Church: how is the Son of God made to abide in the Church in virtue of the Eucharist? It is not because any bread or any wine is so consecrated that it will remain consecrated for ever; as has been said so often, whatever is consecrated is meant to be eaten or to be drunk within a very short space of time; there is no transubstantiating of anything into an uninterrupted everlasting Presence. Bread and wine which are the necessary external signs of the Sacrament do not last long in their natural state. When, therefore, we speak of the permanence of Christ's presence with us through the Eucharist we mean this, that in His infinite bounty He has given power to innumerable men to carry out the great mystery that is an imitation of His own act at the Last Supper. So the Eucharist can be celebrated every day, and if necessary at every hour. Moreover, in virtue of that interval between Consecration and Communion which we have called the only true sacramental development of the Eucharist, it is in effect the fact that He is present with us at all times, at least according to the Latin rite and practice. But it would be wrong to say that the Eucharist was given primarily for the purpose of remaining: its first purpose is the very opposite, to be eaten and to be drunk.

The solemn celebration of the Sacrifice of Mass before the Blessed Sacrament exposed, has seemed to certain strict liturgists an overlapping of divine things which they find difficult to place with comfort of mind. There is, however, supernatural logic in this procedure. It is not one of those instances of accumulation, when devotion of one sort is superadded to another devotion without either of them taking its rank according to its meaning or value. It is certain that the Christian people ought to thank God for the institution of the Eucharist and for the presence to this very day of the Eucharist, as they thank Him for Christ's Nativity, for His Resurrection, for the coming of the Holy Ghost. The solemn remembrance of the Eucharistic mystery is carried out on Corpus Christi day, but, implicitly anyhow, the Church is never without the feeling of gratitude for this greatest of all gifts. The Eucharistic Sacrifice, being

essentially a sacrifice of thankfulness, is the natural means for the Church to render thanks to God for the institution of the Eucharist itself; there could be no more direct mode of acknowledging the debt of gratitude. That there should very frequently be the presence of the consecrated Host with the solemn rite of exposition whilst the Sacrifice of Mass is going on, implies no contradiction; there is no over-lapping of divine Things. As a matter of fact, whenever the priest says Mass at the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in the Tabernacle he celebrates *coram Sanctissimo*, the Tabernacle doors make no difference. The consecrated Body of Christ is, in the eyes of the Church, her most precious Relic, it is a jewel she possesses. And in Presence of that holy Thing she offers her great Sacrifice, as she offers it over the bodies of the martyrs; for the Church truly considers the consecrated Elements in the light of a divine Relic of Something that has come to her from the celebration of the memory of her Lord's death.

It is, of course, quite pardonable that we should surround the Eucharist with a certain amount of anthropomorphism, considering Christ in the divine Sacrament as sharing our human conditions; this is indeed unavoidable; it is simple-minded and uneducated, but it is in fact quite harmless. It comes from the keen grasp of the Real Presence. Yet there are metaphysical principles which are a useful corrective, and one of those principles is, that the divine Reality, the Son of God, under the appearances of bread and wine, in that sacramental state, is entirely above the laws of time and duration: an hour, a day, a week, are the same to that divine Reality. There is no further marvel in the circumstance that the consecrated Elements remain in the Tabernacle for a week, than in the initial marvel of Transubstantiation itself. Concerning that divine Reality the time-factor does not exist; the time-factor is all on our side, and, if we like to put it so, on the side of the accidents which are, so to speak, the mortal garment of the Immortal and the Eternal.

The worship of the Holy Eucharist in the Latin Church during that period, more or less prolonged, which elapses between Consecration and Communion, is two-fold. It is first sacramental and then personal. The sacra-

mental worship has this feature, that practically all its attention is riveted to the fact of the Body and the Blood being the Sacrifice of the new Law and the Food of the soul: this is, as we all know, the older Eucharistic devotion and it has survived in the official liturgical acts at Communion and Benediction. In order to realize the tenor of strict sacramental language we need only remember the two permanent hymns, *O salutaris Hostia* and *Tantum ergo* and the prayer *Deus qui nobis sub Sacramento mirabili*. Only rarely if at all does the older liturgy address the Eucharistic Elements personally, speaking to them as to Christ Himself, and speaking of them as of Christ made present through the sacramental veils. This latter aspect is what I might call the personal approach to the Eucharist and it has to a very large extent superseded the sacramental approach, at least in private devotions. When we go to the altar of the Blessed Sacrament we speak to our Lord, at Benediction we glorify the Son of God, the exposition Throne is the seat of His Majesty. Many people think that this piety towards the Person of Christ in the Eucharist is really a substantial alteration in the ways of Catholicism; one has even read books in which it was asserted that under the guidance of the Holy Ghost the Eucharistic mentality of the Church is being transformed, the Person of Christ replacing the Sacrament of Christ. Put in this wise the assertion is, of course, nonsense. Even the strictest sacramentalist in Eucharistic theology finds ample room for the modern way; there is no departure from the Contents of the Sacrament, those Contents, as we have said, are the supreme rule by which we judge in Eucharistic matters. In virtue of concomitance the whole Person of Christ is under the consecrated Elements. Through a long habit we associate that Person with the consecrated Bread—the Host, because it is the Element that is reserved, not the Wine; but consecrated Wine, kept in the Tabernacle or exposed for solemn worship, would be as adequately and as directly the object of that piety towards the personal Christ, though the faithful might find it more difficult to address their prayers to the Cup than to the white Bread; but this is merely a matter of habit.

As it is a theological, dogmatic fact that the whole Person of Christ is in the Eucharistic Elements this

modern piety is fully justified, it is sacramental, it is even archaic, if we like. Christ Himself said: "He that eateth *Me*" and therefore this personal element expressed in the "*Me*" could be translated at any time into personal worship. We might say that there is something mystical in that new piety; the mystics have found out that there is something more in the Eucharist than the Flesh and Blood, and they have thrown themselves on their glorious discovery. The hagiography of the Catholic Church is full of most sweet and admirable communications of spirit between souls and Christ in the Blessed Sacrament; those intuitions belong to the mysticism of the Eucharist which is a very great and to a certain extent unexplored province.

We have said that through the logic of our theology of the Divinity we must admit that the Three divine Persons are under the Eucharistic veil. *Adoro te devote latens Deitas* could be applied to the Father and to the Holy Ghost when we kneel before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. Will the Eucharist ever be the centre of some Trinitarian mysticism? It is permissible to say that the possibility is not excluded.

The Eucharist truly contains every spiritual delight: "Panem de coelo praestitisti eis, omne delectamentum in se habentem." Two well-known hymns, both of great antiquity, may be cited as expressing, one the sacramental approach to the Eucharist, the other the personal approach. The *Pange lingua* of St. Thomas Aquinas is strictly sacramental, the *Adoro te devote* is predominantly personal:

Jesu quem velatum nunc aspicio  
 Oro fiat illud quod tam sitio  
 Ut te revelata cernens facie  
 Visu sim beatus tuae gloriae.

This beautiful hymn is also attributed to St. Thomas, but recent scholarship seems to cast doubt on the Thomistic authorship; the antiquity of the hymn is not contested, however, and it is interesting to notice that this personal love of the Eucharist is not exclusively modern. The *Pange lingua* itself contains the words: *Se dat suis manibus* which is an evident allusion to concomitance, through which the whole Person of Christ becomes present in the Eucharist. It could never be more



than a preponderance of emphasis in this matter of the sacramental and the personal realization on the part of the Christian of the Contents of the Eucharist. As already insinuated, the Catholic people enjoy wonderful liberty of action in their use of the Eucharist; provided they remember they are dealing with a Sacrament which is also a Sacrifice, their devotion and their mysticism in this matter cannot go wrong; but it would be a positive error and an indefensible attitude if at any time this setting were forgotten by untrained enthusiasts, if the Eucharist were spoken of exclusively as a Presence of Christ here on earth without any reference to the sacramental conditions and the sacrificial aspect. Such false piety would be the destruction of the mystery of the Eucharist, as it would not recognize a difference between the natural state of Christ and the sacramental state; it would relegate the doctrine of Transubstantiation to the region of useless theories and the final result would be a presence of Christ for which there would be no dogmatic data.

The faith of the Catholic people in the Blessed Sacrament is a marvel of the supernatural order comparable in greatness with the mystery itself which is its object; the unceasing presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church makes it possible for us, in the midst of a world that is hostile to the Unseen, to enjoy this great faith, which with all its manifestations is worthy of all our reverence and all our love.

Who would dare to speak or to write a single word that would in any way offend that splendid sensibility of the Catholic people which enables them to perceive their Lord and Saviour under the sacramental appearances? Who would dare to say a word of criticism where there is such intensity and such sincerity of faith? But there is a duty of guidance and enlightenment incumbent on the priest in this sacrosanct matter as in everything else that belongs to the Christian inheritance. We owe it to the souls that are fed on the Holy Eucharist to tell them something of the mystery of the Lord's Body and the Lord's Blood. The Blessed Sacrament, vast as its Contents are, is still a definite dispensation, as I said at the beginning of this article, and the Catholic ought to be taught the theological outlines of the mystery that is so dear to him; he ought to be reminded of the connection between the Sacrifice and the banquet, so

that at no time he may really separate Communion from Mass. He possesses enough dogmatic instruction to relish the older forms of Eucharistic prayer and Eucharistic hymnology. There ought to be in his Eucharistic devotion that sense of mystery which is such an important feature in the traditional Catholic piety, so that he is aware of the fact that Christ is on the altar in virtue of a series of incomprehensible miracles. This aspect is so often left out in modern ways of approaching the divine Sacrament. Hymnologists, compilers of prayer-books and promoters of devotions have not always rendered good service to Catholic theology. The ideal hymn in which I think Catholic genius has best expressed itself in the Eucharistic faith is the *Adoro Te devote*. In that hymn intense personal fervour is wonderfully combined with that delicate reserve which comes over the Christian in presence of the Mystery of mysteries.



## THE REFORMERS AND THE MASS

DR. MESSENGER'S NEW STUDY.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. ANDREW BECK, A.A.

**I**N the history of the Church there had been attacks on the clergy before the sixteenth century. But none was as radical as that which Martin Luther initiated in the autumn of 1517. It was an attempt to destroy the whole Christian conception of the office of the priest. Luther's unsettled introspective mind, nourished on a nominalist philosophy, imbued with a sentimentalism native to the German people, had come to develop the theory that Faith alone justifies. No matter how bad a man might be, if he believed firmly he was saved. "Pecca fortiter et crede firmius." Works were useless. But the Mass, a sacrifice offered to God in satisfaction for sin, is a work. Therefore, in his system the Mass could find no place. It must be abolished; and with it the Catholic Priesthood. Luther succeeded, and among his followers the Mass and the Priesthood perished.

So much is admitted by all historians. But when the story of the Reformation comes nearer home there is less agreement. To what extent did the Continental Reformation affect the movement in England? Through what stages did the Reformation pass? And how did it change the teaching of the English Church on the questions of the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass and the powers of the Priesthood? The main point of disagreement between Catholics and Protestants has, of course, been the vexed question of the validity of Anglican Orders, but in fact this particular problem cannot be discussed apart from a study of the whole reforming movement in England.

<sup>1</sup> *The Reformation, The Mass and The Priesthood. A Documented History with Special Reference to the Question of Anglican Orders. Volume I. The Revolt from the Mediæval Church.* By Ernest C. Messenger, Ph.D.(Louvain). Demy 8vo. pp. xii.+577. (Longmans, Green & Co. 18s.)

For some time past Dr. Messenger has shown us the interest he has been taking in Reformation history. In his big new work of which we now have the first volume he has undertaken to examine the Eucharistic teaching of the principal Reformers, and to discuss the whole question of Anglican orders *ab initio*. He takes the widest possible view of his subject and suggests that the proper introduction to such a study should be a review of the doctrines of the primitive Church and their development during the Middle Ages. There was a time when the Church taught the truth uncorrupted on the Mass and the Priesthood. That is the point at which to begin. It can then be seen "whether the later Catholic conception is a development of the early teaching, or a corruption of it—in other words, whether the Catholic or the Protestant conception of the Eucharist and the Priesthood is the true one." The book is therefore divided into four parts. The first deals with the historical development of the three inter-connected doctrines of the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass and the effects of the sacrament of Holy Orders from Apostolic times to the end of the Middle Ages. The second part is an account of the Continental Reformation with regard to these doctrines. Thirdly, we are given a thorough study of the changes in doctrine which took place in England. This is done in two further parts, one dealing with the Reformation under Henry VIII and the other with the more radical changes under Edward VI.

The first part (pp. 1-102) is entitled "The Mass and the Priesthood in Scripture and Tradition," and I think that Dr. Messenger must have had a good deal of difficulty in dealing with it. He had to avoid making this introduction to the main question too long, and at the same time had to bear in mind that for non-Catholic readers this section is going to be of great importance, for it contains the answer to the question whether the Reformers of the sixteenth century were really returning to primitive doctrine or not. However, Dr. Messenger faithfully carries out the promise of his Introduction, to quote the original documents as much as possible and let them speak for themselves. "We shall, of course, comment on their significance, but at any rate the reader will be in a position to judge whether or not our com-

ment is justified by the evidence produced."<sup>2</sup> There is a certain sketchiness in some of the chapters, and a tendency for the work to appear disconnected, and this is perhaps accentuated throughout the book by the use of numbered sections. However, every aspect of the question is dealt with satisfactorily. There are chapters on the Real Presence and the Mass in Scripture and Patristic Tradition, the development of the ordination rites, and the sacramental theology of the Middle Ages, finishing with an account of the formulation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.<sup>3</sup>

There is an especially good chapter on the mediæval theology of the sacrament of Holy Order. Dr. Messenger faces the difficulties raised by the scholastic discussion as to whether the Episcopate is a separate order and discusses them fully. His conclusion is worth quoting.

The scholastic treatment of the episcopate was thus inadequate and unsatisfactory, but it was hardly unorthodox. It was bound to change in one of two directions, that is to say, the episcopate would either come to be regarded as a

<sup>2</sup> I may note here that Dr. Messenger's comments are always firmly expressed and sometimes very pointed. If he disagrees with another author he says so, roundly. In the course of the book the errors of such well-known authors as Canon Dixon, Dr. Kidd, Dr. Darwell Stone, Mr. H. A. Wilson, Fr. Sydney Smith, S.J., Mr. Belloc and M. l'Abbé Constant are duly noted, commented on and rectified. The errors of the last-named are tracked down with special pertinacity.

<sup>3</sup> I have noticed one or two inaccurate references, e.g. : p. 10, n. 2 should be *Ad. Ephes.* xx., and n. 4 *Adv. Haeres.* xviii., 4-5; p. 27, n. 1 should be c.xl., and n. 2 should be *Apol.*, I, 67, and the following note, I, 65. I think that the reference to St. Jerome (p. 76) should be *Ep.* cxlvi. On p. 69, in explaining St. Augustine's teaching on the form of the sacraments, Dr. Messenger uses, I think, an unfortunate example. He quotes from Tract 80 *In Joannem* : "In aqua verbum mandat; detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum." Tixeront has shown that in this text "sacramentum" probably means only the blessed water, and that "verbum" does not mean the form (*Histoire des Dogmes*, T. II, p. 398). There is a better and more appropriate text in *Sermones Inediti*, VI, 3 : "Tolle verbum, panis est et vinum. Adde verbum et jam aliud est. Et ipsum aliud, quid est? Corpus Christi et sanguis Christi." See Batiffol in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XVI, 1916, pp. 538-540. Cf. *Documentation Catholique*, T. XVII, May 28th, 1927, col. 1356.

*separate order and sacrament*, or else, as a mere *dignitas* it would cease to be regarded as absolutely necessary for the Church, and it would come to be held that a presbyterian polity is a possible one, and that presbyters can if necessary ordain—in other words, that there is no essential difference between priest and bishop. The Catholic tradition developed in the former direction, while the Protestant reformers developed in the latter. This is very important, and must be borne in mind when we are interpreting Reformed documents. Thus, as we shall see, when Reformed works and formularies imply that bishops are only useful functionaries, and stress the fact that bishop and priest in the early church were the same office—as is the case with the Continental Protestant and some of the English formularies of the Reformation period—the implication is already one which is tending in a heretical direction.

Dr. Messenger goes on to deal with the validity of heretical ordinations, quoting especially the teaching of Peter Lombard, St. Bonaventure, and St. Thomas, but I was a little surprised to find so short a discussion of the question of intention in the administration of the sacraments. It plays such an important part in the condemnation of Anglican Orders that I expected it to receive special treatment. I suspect that Dr. Messenger is reserving a chapter for a discussion of this question in his second volume, so that I merely note that, although the opinion of St. Thomas is given in a long quotation, the question as a whole is not fully discussed.

Part Two deals with the Continental Reformation in its teaching on the Eucharist. While Dr. Messenger disclaims any intention of giving a "complete account" of the doctrine of the Reformers, he has in fact given us a very full study, based on their own writings, of the development of the Eucharistic teaching of the principal Reformers.

Luther began by denying that the Mass is really a sacrifice, though he admitted the expression "Eucharistic sacrifice" in the sense of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but not of propitiation. In fact he converted the Mass from a sacrifice into a sacrament, and, following him, the Augsburg Confession uses the word in this sense: "The Mass was instituted that faith in those who use the Sacrament may recollect the benefits received through Christ." On the other hand, the force of our Lord's words: "This is My Body" impressed Luther so strongly that although he denied the

"sophistries" of transubstantiation, he continued to believe in the Real Presence, brought about by the words of consecration. He was the only Reformer to do so consistently. Melancthon was led at first to favour the Lutheran theory of consubstantiation, but he later abandoned this, and finally seems to have given up belief in the Real Presence altogether. In 1541 he maintained that Christ is present in the Eucharist only when it is used. For, he argued, Christ's promise was not to the bread but to men, and so His Body and Blood are in the bread only when it is used by men, in communion. Zwingli, the Zurich leader, and his successor Bullinger, denied on the other hand any kind of objective presence in the sacrament. Christ is received only by those who have faith, and is received only in the soul. The bread and wine are mere symbols.<sup>4</sup>

From 1529 onwards the disputes between Luther and the Zwinglians on this subject became very bitter. It was Martin Bucer of Strassburg who tried to find common ground in their contradictory opinions. He himself denied transubstantiation, and already in 1524 had given up belief in the Real Presence.<sup>5</sup> But he was a diplomatist more than a theologian, and spent much time in elaborating a series of ambiguous formulae which he hoped would be acceptable to both parties. He seems to have found a suitable expression in the statement that Christ is "exhibited" in the Eucharist. Dr. Messenger suggests that he first used the word in 1536. But in the Cassel Formula of 1534 the words "signa exhibitiva" are used of the bread and wine, and Bucer may have used the expression "Christ is exhibited" as early as October, 1530.<sup>6</sup> However, his first success as a peacemaker was at Wittenberg in May, 1536, and the Articles which were

<sup>4</sup> All the Reformers emphasize the importance of the communion. The Body of Christ is related to the bread only when the sacrament is being used. Stated somewhat untheologically, they all, except Luther, changed the "form" of the sacrament from the consecration to the communion; and most of their disputes centre round the meaning of "presence" at the moment of communion. Thus Cranmer in 1550: "I teach not, as you do, that the body and blood of Christ is contained in the sacrament, being reserved, but that in the ministration thereof we receive the body and blood of Christ."

<sup>5</sup> See H. Eells, *Martin Bucer* (1931), p. 73.

<sup>6</sup> Eells, *op. cit.*, pp. 177 and 111.

signed by both parties contained the following statements:

And so we think and teach that the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present, exhibited and received with the bread and wine.

And although we deny that transubstantiation takes place . . . we grant that by a sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ, that is to say, when the bread is given there is at once present and truly exhibited the body of Christ. For we believe the body of Christ is not present when outside the ceremony it is preserved in a box, or is shown in processions as is done by the papists.<sup>7</sup>

How Melancthon persuaded Luther to accept the last sentence is something of a mystery. On the other hand, Bucer's admission that Christ is "substantially present" was a subterfuge, for he insisted that the Body of Christ was in Heaven alone and nowhere else. The Strassburg Reformer was a true apostle of "comprehensiveness."

Calvin, who denied an objective presence, but held that in the act of communion there is a "virtual" presence of Christ (non corporaliter quidem, sed spiritualiter per vivificam operationem), agreed to and frequently made use of the word "exhibit."

With all this, of course, the Reformers denied that the sacrament of Order conferred any real power. They held, following Luther, that the power of the "priesthood" is possessed radically by every Christian, and that ordination does no more than give authority to exercise power already possessed. There seems to have been great confusion in their minds between order and jurisdiction. Dr. Messenger's fully-documented chapters on the Lutheran conception of the Christian Ministry,

<sup>7</sup> Messenger, p. 137. The last sentence from Eells, p. 202. The latter, rather strangely, I think, translates "exhiberi" by "offered." It is worth noting that the text of these Articles was written prior to the Council of Trent, uses the words "really and substantially present" but rejects explicitly the Real Presence. Yet it is one of the least tortuous of Bucer's formulas of concord. No wonder Dr. Messenger warns us that it is unsafe to build arguments on isolated texts which seem to imply a "Real Presence."

Mr. Eells's book, in the nature of an apologia for Bucer, is worth comparing with Bossuet's caustic comments on the Strassburg Reformer's dishonesty and duplicity. Bossuet speaks of Bucer and Capito as "ces deux fameux architectes des equivoques les plus raffinées" (*Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, Livre IV). He translates "exhiberi" by "donné."



and the Lutheran ordination rites show this very clearly. He shows also how the Catholic theologians defended the traditional teaching, and concludes this part with an account of the formulation of the Catholic doctrine at the Council of Trent.

With the background thus filled in, Dr. Messenger begins to consider the English Reformation, under Henry VIII (Part Three), and under Edward VI (Part Four). These two parts take up more than half the book (pp. 233-566), and they provide the most thorough account which has yet appeared, of the doctrinal changes which grew up in the English Church during those two eventful reigns. Dr. Messenger has completely mastered his sources, subjects them to a most acute and searching analysis, and establishes conclusions which seem to me to be incontrovertible.

Although he limits himself strictly to a consideration of the two doctrines of the Eucharist and the sacrament of Holy Order, he produces enough evidence to destroy for ever the myth of Henrician orthodoxy. Apart altogether from the matter of Papal Supremacy, the Henrician Bishops were tainted with heresy, especially on the question of Holy Orders. It may be disputed whether Henry really thought that he possessed the power of consecrating bishops or ordaining priests, but there is little doubt that almost all his Bishops in 1540 would have admitted that he possessed such a power, had he pressed them. This may not have been Lutheranism; it may merely have been the King's self-conceited arrogance and the subservience of courtier Bishops, but Henry's suggestive questions and the episcopal answers are there for all to read, and Dr. Messenger has done a good piece of work in analysing them and pointing out their implications.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, it is worth recalling

<sup>8</sup> Incidentally, Dr. Messenger raises an interesting point with regard to these questions. There is one set of anonymous answers. Dixon (*History of Church of England*, II, 310) considered that they were a summary of the answers of several prelates. Dr. Messenger in his careful reading of them, has noted that towards the end the pronoun "I" is used. They must be the answers of a single person. Dr. Messenger is concerned to show that they are not the answers of either Cranmer or Barlow, but makes no positive suggestion. One may hazard the opinion that they belong to Stephen Gardiner, whose silence on the matter has always been something of a puzzle.



that as early as 1536, eight bishops out of the whole twenty-one were men of the "New Learning." There is more truth than is usually admitted in Pope's satirical line about the Gospel light first shining in Anne Boleyn's eyes, less perhaps on account of her personal ascendancy over Henry than on account of the influence of her party at Court. In 1531 Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, wrote to his master that Anne and her father were "more Lutheran than Luther himself," and in the following year he declared that they were the true apostles of Lutheranism in England; and their influence was far more enduring than he could have guessed at the time, for it was the "Boleyn Bishops" as Gairdner calls them, Cranmer, Latimer, Roland Lee, Goodrich, Shaxton, Foxe, Barlow and Capon, all appointed between 1533 and 1536 under the Boleyn influence, who produced the first doctrinal rift in the English episcopate. From then onwards there were two parties among the Bishops, and it was the growing strength of the left wing which more than anything else was responsible for the success of the Reformation after Henry's death.

Under Henry the Church in England began to publish various statements of belief, two in the form of Articles—the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Six Articles of 1539; and two in the form of rather long-winded homiletic explanations of faith—the *Bishops' Book* of 1537 and the *King's Book* of 1543. (The Thirteen Articles of 1538 never received official sanction.) On the orthodoxy of these formularies Dr. Messenger is very definite. He proves that there is a Lutheran taint in all of them, except perhaps the Six Articles. He shows, conclusively I think, that the Ten Articles cannot be interpreted as teaching transubstantiation, and expresses his "entire and absolute disagreement" with M. l'Abbé Constant and Mr. Belloc on this question.<sup>9</sup> He notes, too, that staunch "Anglo-Catholics" like Tunstall were not immune, even in 1538, from suspicion of heresy on the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. Tunstall in fact seems to have had doubts about transubstantiation, and

<sup>9</sup> I notice that since the publication of Dr. Messenger's book M. Constant has re-affirmed his position in the April number of the *Downside Review*. I feel sure that those who have read this book will find that M. Constant's arguments do not carry much conviction.

Dr. Messenger makes the interesting suggestion that he may have assisted Cranmer in the composition of the Communion Book of 1548. The Ten Articles and the *Bishops' Book* were in fact a compromise, and of set purpose they do not exclude a Lutheran interpretation. Cranmer himself certainly thought that the *Bishops' Book* was a step in the direction of the Reformers, for he sent an angry letter of remonstrance to a certain Justice whose servants had said that the Book "put all the knaves of the New Learning to silence." "And whereas," he wrote, "your servants report that all things are restored by this new book to their old use . . . truly you and your servants be so blinded, that you call old that is new and new that is old; and of malice, as it appeareth, you will not learn of them that can tell you, what is new and what is old."<sup>10</sup> Similarly, it is difficult to defend Henry's personal orthodoxy in face of Cranmer's assertion that towards the end of his life the King had ordered him to draw up a form "for the alteration of the Mass into a Communion." The Reformation in England was in fact a steady growth from the beginning. It flowered under Edward, but the seed was sown and the first shoots began to appear before the death of his father in 1547.

Finally, in his Fourth Part (pp. 325-566), Dr. Messenger studies this flowering of the Reformation. After a short chapter on Cranmer and Ridley, he gives a careful assessment of the theological complexion of the Episcopate, at the beginning of Edward's reign, and at the end. It is most thoroughly done, and very illuminating. He divides the Bishops into three classes: "Anglo-Catholics," "Protestants" and "Opportunists." In 1547 there were eleven of the first, eight of the second, and eight of the third.<sup>11</sup> By the end of the reign the numbers were

<sup>10</sup> Letter CCII: "To a Justice," in Cranmer's Works (Parker Society), Vol. II, p. 351. See the continuation in Pollard's *Cranmer*, p. 120, with the author's pointed remark that this dispute as to the real intention of Anglican doctrine was the first of a series which is not yet exhausted.

<sup>11</sup> Dr. Messenger has unaccountably overlooked Knight of Bath and Wells, and says that the See was vacant from 1541 until Barlow's translation in 1548. His account of Wharton, *alias* Parfew, seems also to be faulty. Wharton was not deprived under Mary, but was appointed to Hereford in place of the invalidly consecrated Harley.

four, thirteen and five respectively, a significant and pregnant strengthening of the Reforming party.

The book then goes on to give a detailed examination of the great liturgical changes of the reign—the Communion Book, the two Prayer Books and the Ordinal. This part is extremely well done, and much more complete than the pioneer study by Gasquet and Bishop. Dr. Messenger has worked through all the texts with minute and meticulous care, he compares them with one another, and with the old Catholic forms, and establishes without any shadow of doubt how completely Protestant, and consciously so, the whole movement was. The analysis of Cranmer's book on the Eucharist, published in 1550, and of the dispute between the Archbishop and Gardiner is masterly. A long sequence of very full quotations shows how completely Bucerian or even possibly Zwinglian his attitude had become.<sup>19</sup> And it was Cranmer who, almost single-handed, produced the new liturgy of the Church of England. When he wrote these successive works, each more definitely Protestant than the last, he had completely abandoned the Catholic belief in the Priesthood, and hated the Catholic Mass with a cold, conscientious and bitter hatred. His work and the Forty-Two Articles which followed were the full flowering of the seed which had been sown in Henry's day, and the flower was exactly of the kind which had taken root and flourished on the Continent—radically and unmistakably Protestant. Bucer, Vermigli, Fagius, John à Lasco and other prominent Continental Protestants were in England, encouraging, helping, criticizing, and as a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* long ago remarked: "We should advise nobody to study the real history of this matter who has not nerve enough to recognize how closely the Church of England lay in those days to mere

<sup>19</sup> The dates of Cranmer's changes of opinion have been a matter of some dispute. He seems to have given up belief in transubstantiation in 1538 if not earlier, but he continued to believe in some kind of Presence in the Sacrament, though not necessarily in the Lutheran fashion. In 1546 most probably, he gave up belief in an objective presence, though he does not seem to have gone as far as the extreme Zwinglians. The Rev. C. H. Smyth (*Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI*) maintains that from 1538 until his death he was consistently a Bucerian. Dr. Messenger is not so sure.

Protestantism." It had deliberately eliminated the Mass and the Priesthood.

Dr. Messenger has written a book of the very first importance, packed with quotations from original sources, commented on in a lively and pungent style. It is a book which no student of the Reformation movement in England, or of the spirit and teaching of the Church of England can afford to neglect. Never before in a single volume has the doctrine of the English Reformers on the Mass and the Priesthood been subjected to so close and careful an examination. Nor has the English Reformation been so fully studied in relation to the Continental background, and shown to follow so closely the Continental model. More restricted in its objective than Gairdner's somewhat diffuse volumes on Lollardy, dealing specifically with those doctrines only which concern the Mass and the Priesthood, this remarkably complete examination of the question leaves no doubt as to the fundamentally Protestant and anti-sacerdotal character of the English Reformation.<sup>13</sup>

Dr. Messenger promises us in due course a second volume which will deal with the Marian reconciliation, the condemnation of the English Ordinal, the Elizabethan Settlement, and other matters culminating in a discussion of the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*. This first volume is an earnest of its value, and we shall look forward to its publication with the keenest anticipation.

<sup>13</sup> One may perhaps query the value of such lavish use of italics. They are very helpful in emphasizing significant words and phrases in a quotation, but in other respects they seem to introduce into the atmosphere of calm and careful scholarship to which this book of right belongs something of the more partial and less composed spirit of pamphleteering. Incidentally, the spelling of "Lollardy" invites comment. There seems in the book to be a pronounced bias in favour of the form "Lollardry."

## USURY AND PROFIT-EARNING

BY THE REV. DOM J. B. McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B.

- I. USING WEALTH TO MAKE MORE WEALTH.
- II. WHERE THE BANKERS COME IN.
- III. THE MUTUUM CONTRACT.
- IV. THE DIVIDING LINE.
- V. EXTRINSIC TITLE OF LUCRUM CESSANS.

### I. USING WEALTH TO MAKE MORE WEALTH.

IT will make for clearness if we first consider the using of money to make more money; looking at St. Thomas's teaching on this subject, and Benedict XIV's. St. Thomas says money was instituted for making exchanges.<sup>1</sup> And there are two kinds of exchanging. The housewife uses money to buy what she needs: and this is natural, necessary, laudable. The trader exchanges money for money, or goods for money, not to meet his needs, but to gain profit. This profit-seeking is looked down upon; because seeking more money in order to make more money might go on for ever, and greed does not know where to stop. But seeking the profit is in itself neither wrong nor right; it depends on your motives. Right motives are, e.g., to support your household, to help the poor, to meet the public convenience by providing things that are needed for the national life; and taking the profits, not as the thing you were after, but as the wages of your trouble.

You make the profit by selling dearer than you bought. To justify the selling price there is the risk and the cost of bringing the goods to where they are wanted, and of making them more useful or handy: there are fluctuating prices to take advantage of. So both your buying cheap and your selling dear can be fair deals, as they ought to be.

Before passing on let me ask this question: Since the use of money is to make exchanges, and there are two kinds of exchanges, does not that mean that there are

<sup>1</sup> 2 2, 78, 1.

*two uses of money*, the natural use and the trading use?

Later,<sup>2</sup> St. Thomas speaks about investing money in someone else's business. He who entrusts his money to either a merchant or a manufacturer in a sort of partnership, does not hand over to him the ownership of the money. It is still the investor's money, so that at his risk does the merchant trade with it or the manufacturer work. That is why the investor can rightly claim a share of the profits, as coming from his property.

Later again<sup>3</sup> he points out that the chief cause of the profits is the efforts of the manufacturer; while the investor's money is only the material or instrument used. But the investor can rightly claim a share of the profits earned by his money.

Now I ask you to notice that St. Thomas writes these things without showing the slightest consciousness of our difficulties about usury; with no suspicion that anyone will ask the questions that run as an undercurrent in our minds while we read him. These questions:

I thought the Catholic teaching was that money is barren; that money does not make money, and you cannot take a breed for barren metal—*fenus, Tokos*?

And that you cannot charge anything for the use of money? Does not *Usura* mean that, charging for the use of money?

And that you cannot transfer the use of money without transferring the ownership?

None of these troubled St. Thomas. Yet he wrote about usury just after; but all that he said about transferring the trading-use of money and about earning profits on it was only by way of contrasting it with usury.

Benedict XIV repeated in the 1700's what St. Thomas had said in the 1200's.

Benedict XIV<sup>4</sup> says that money can constantly be put out and invested quite rightly, either to bring in an annuity, or to carry on lawful trade and business and

<sup>2</sup> 78, 2, ad 5.

<sup>3</sup> 78, 3, ad 1 and 3.

<sup>4</sup> Denzinger, 1911 edition, 1477, 1478.



draw profits from it. And there is no doubt that in such contracts is found a lawful method and system for keeping up and developing human intercourse and productive business, to the benefit of all.

And if we feel that this putting out of money to bring in an annuity is exactly the usury we understood to be condemned, he says he mentions these contracts because they are contracts of an utterly different nature from the *mutuum* contract in which alone can usury occur.

The root of the matter is that the wealth of mankind grows simply because we use our existing wealth to produce more wealth.

If the wealth of the world were not continually growing but remained a fixed quantity, it is plain that no one could gain wealth but through someone else's losing it. But, in fact, new wealth is always a-making, to replace what is each year consumed, and to add to the amenities of human life. Everyone who in any way ministers to the production of wealth or to preserving and increasing the amenities has therefore a right to share in them. A man with capital may see his way to partaking in this good work and gaining a share of the wealth produced as well as recovering his share of the cost of production.

St. Thomas speaks of enterprises undertaken in order that the country may have what it ought to have. This wide phrase includes not only commerce and manufacture, but also ships, harbours, universities, land reclamation; in fact, anything whatever that is for the public good, and that people think is worth paying for. If you find capital for any of these, you are entitled to take a profit as the reward of your enterprise; provided always that you put your money in at your own risk.

I see no reason for treating commerce and industry as a separate class, and saying that in them you are a partner and therefore get your share of profits.

For all these other enterprises are also for the public good, whether run by city, State, or individuals; and are judged worth paying for by the public; and you who are a partner in the enterprise are entitled to a share in whatever price the public think worth paying;

just as much as and on the same grounds as you are entitled to the profits of your factory.

It is all part of conserving and developing human wealth.

I do not believe that the Church ever forbade this taking interest on money thus put out at your own risk to make more wealth. If she did, it is evident that neither St. Thomas nor Benedict XIV had heard of it.

It seems to me that these good works include not only productive and distributive industry and commerce, but permanent things, roads, bridges, harbours, in fact, everything that people feel it worth while to spend money on for the public good. If the bridge is built by the capital of a few, they must not lose their capital for the public benefit. They could be repaid out of rates and taxes, or could receive annuities. A fair standard for estimating would be the average profits their money would have made if used in industry at that period. The annuities, or the sinking fund, is the method by which the rest of the public pay their share of the cost of the bridge.

A town council wishing to build a town hall or a waterworks might in theory accumulate money for years beforehand by economies, or by levying a special rate. But it may be more practical to borrow money from those who have already accumulated it and are glad to put it out for a period to bring them an annual revenue, as Benedict XIV expresses it. The rates levied afterwards to pay interest and sinking fund on the loan are the citizens' method of paying for their new properties.

It is part of the Church law that church funds must take part in this developing of human wealth. The motive for investing nun's dowries and other church funds is, of course, to earn a revenue for the support of the Convent, or of those who do the duties for which the money was given. To earn, the fund must in some way be used in that development of human wealth that I have spoken of; and to continue earning, it must be used in some undertaking that is not likely to fail. Therefore, the Canon law prescribes safe, lawful and remunerative investments: "*tutis, licitis, ac fructiferis nominibus.*"

In gilt-edged investments there is no practical risk



of loss; but practical certainty of interest. And it has been asked what right you can have to the gain when you risk no loss. But your right to profit does not spring from your risk of loss; for both alike spring from your owning the invested money; as we shall see more fully later.

## II. WHERE THE BANKERS COME IN.

In the parable there was a man who did not trust himself to trade successfully with his lord's money; and, for fear of losing it altogether, he hid it. The master asked why then he had not given it to the bankers, who would have paid something for the use of it. This is simply taking the benefit of expert knowledge to keep the fund safe. It divides the process of investing the money in trade into two stages. The bankers are experts in knowing which traders are likely to fail. So I lend the money to the bankers and they invest it in a "safe" business. And out of my share of the profits they get their commission. In the parable there were three stages. The owner committed the money to his servant: the servant was to take it to the banker, the banker to the real trader or producer who could make it earn profits. Since the whole process of putting that money to foster industry and earn profits is right and just, each stage in the process is also right and just. The justification of the whole process is likewise the justification of each stage. And the danger of the whole process is that too much wealth is under the control of a few bankers.

This is the place to observe that financiers have devised other ways of putting money into an industry, not to foster that industry, but to obtain control of it, and ultimately wrest it from its owners. This is to abuse the power that money gives. But it does not alter the fact that the world's wealth can only grow and develop by using the wealth already produced, and stored in the form of saving.

Perpetual annuities raise a deeper question, raised long since by Socialist thinkers. If a bridge was built under the Roman emperors with borrowed money, and the family of the money-lender was still surviving and receiving interest on the money, we should feel that something was wrong. Because that family provided

a bridge that has benefited all generations until now, does it follow that in every generation all workers in the neighbourhood are to give some of their earnings to keep that family? The same question arises in the endowment of a religious house, or a university. If the endowment is in money, it has to be invested to bring in annual revenue. At first it will be entrusted to people who can use it to establish a profitable business and are glad to pay interest. But if they agree to pay a perpetual annuity, it means that for centuries after some body of workers will have to provide that annuity out of their labour. If the endowment is in land no problem arises as long as the monks farm it themselves. But if they let it out, reserving a tithe-rent, the result in the course of centuries is that because land was given to Wetheral Priory in the time of William Rufus, my rector is still paying tithe to the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle.

I know that a good landlord is worth a great deal to his tenants, more perhaps than the rent they pay him; and a monastery could be a good landlord through centuries and benefit generation after generation while sharing the fruit of their labours.

But I do not see how perpetual annuities could be justified by a single payment made centuries ago. Unless, perhaps, the annuities were managed as a fund that keeps in touch with industry, and from time to time puts capital into undertakings that will earn the annuity.

Socialists and Labour men have raised this difficulty for many decades past, as part of the wide grievance that most of the product of labour goes into hands that took no share in producing it.

### III. THE CONTRACT CALLED MUTUUM.

This teaching on the lawful and desirable use of money to make more money stands side by side with the teaching that it is sinful to make any profit whatever from the loan that is called *mutuum*.

In the encyclical *Vix pervenit* of November 1st, 1745, Benedict XIV writes:—

Fourthly, we urge you to shut the door against the silly talk of those who say that nowadays the discussion on usury

is only a question of names, because whenever money is transferred to another, no matter what the reason, profit is regularly taken for it. How false this is and how remote from truth we clearly see if we consider that the one contract is of an absolutely different nature from the other; and that there is likewise great difference in the effects of such different contracts. In reality there is the clearest difference between profit which is rightly drawn from money and therefore can be retained both in conscience and in law; and other profit which is drawn from money wrongly and therefore entails restitution both in conscience and in law.

Our problem is to discern this absolute difference in the nature of the two contracts.

About *mutuum* and usury, Benedict XIV says:<sup>5</sup> "The class of sin called usury has its home in the contract of *mutuum*. This contract of its very nature requires that you return only the same amount as you received. . . . No one can help seeing that in many cases a man is bound to help another by a simple and bare *mutuum*."

St. Thomas<sup>6</sup> says: "Next we consider the sin of usury which is committed *in mutuis*." His conclusion is "that it is in itself unjust to receive *usuram* for *pecunia mutuata*."

Apart from the puzzle of their seeing no clash between these principles and their teaching on putting out money to earn profits, there was the puzzle of their seeing as an obvious thing that the law of repaying equal for equal is contained in the very nature of *mutuum*. For many years I could not guess what exactly the word *mutuum* suggested to them.

De Lugo said *mutuum* is short for *meum tuum*, meaning that what was mine is now yours. And that fact is indeed the root of the matter. But lately it has dawned on me that to St. Thomas *mutuum* simply meant an exchange (mutual, *muto*); exchanging three loaves now for three loaves to-morrow evening; ten shillings now for ten shillings next pay-day. And so he could write as an obvious truth: "it is in itself wrong to make a charge for the use of money, which charge is called Usury." As wrong as to charge you three loaves for the three I lent you, and a fourth for eating them.

<sup>5</sup> Benedict XIV, *Vix pervenit*, November 1st, 1745.

<sup>6</sup> 2, 2, 78, 1.

So, likewise, Benedict XIV could write: "The law of exchange (*mutuum*) necessarily consists in the equality of what is given and what is received." They viewed the loan simply as an exchange. And it is obvious that exchange must be equal. For if you offer £95 for my £100, I answer no; £105 for my £100, if you want an unequal exchange.

But that argument only leaves us wondering why they think a loan *should* be a mere exchange; and why they spend time in pointing out that money is not like a cow or a hen that produces a breed of some sort, a *fenus*, *Tokos*; nor is it like a taxi or a threshing machine, for whose use you pay an *usura* when you do not want to buy the thing itself. Why insist on this after telling us that money *does* make money when you have the use of it for a time in trade and industry, where you are adding to the country's wealth and making your own living out of it?

#### IV. THE DIVIDING LINE.

What is the root difference between *mutuum* and the other contracts?

Let me now give a simple instance which seems to show the dividing line we are looking for, which was so plain to them.

On the race-course you ask me to lend you five shillings to back this horse. I answer: Put five on for me also; and I give you ten shillings. The first five shillings has now changed owners. The second has not.

Quite plainly that second five shillings is still my money; which I have entrusted to you for a definite purpose, to back Vindictive. You must account to me how the venture fared. If it wins, the winnings are mine; if it is lost, mine is the loss. You cannot honestly use that money for anything else.

Equally plainly, the first five shillings is now your money, to do what you like with. It is no concern of mine if you change your mind and back another horse, or spend it on your lunch. If it wins, or is lost, the winnings and the loss are yours. My only claim on you is this: I *gave* you five shillings of my money; you must *give* me five shillings of yours later on. That is the *exchange* between us.

A doubt lingers. I *lent* you the money; nothing was said about *giving* it. True; but you got that money to use as your own, for your own uses, at your own free discretion; and surely that is the very meaning of ownership. Since you have that free use of it, you now own it. It is your money now; not mine.

St. Thomas's discussion of *Mutuum* therefore begins at this fundamental point: that there is no sense in saying: "I give you the free use of the money for your own uses, but I don't give you the money itself."

Now, there is a three-cornered contrast:—

A. That free use of money cannot be separated from the ownership; it *is* the ownership of the money.

Whereas, in sharp contrast:—

B. I can hand you my money to use in trade for me, while I still own it.

And, in a different contrast:—

C. I can give you for a time the free use of a horse or of a house, without giving you the ownership.

The point of contrasting A and C is that having the use of a horse for your own purposes is a different thing from owning the horse; whereas, having the use of the money for your own purposes is the same thing as owning the money. The point of contrasting A and B is that in A the money is now yours to use for your own purposes; but in B the money is still mine, to be used by you for the purposes I have agreed to.

At this point let us recall that *Res fructificat domino*, and we see the utter difference that Benedict XIV saw in the nature of the two contracts. In one the money has become the borrower's, and for him alone can it earn profit; in the other contract the money is still the lender's and will earn profit for the lender alone.

Thus, in every putting out of money, the crucial question must be asked: Who now owns the money and will bear the loss if it be lost? By that simple question we divide all transactions into two classes: one in which the recipient has become the owner of the money; the other in which the original owner still owns it.

We have the two clearly instanced in two parables:—

1. "Lend me three loaves": the lending them for my own use makes them my loaves, and you will have no say in how I use them. I will repay you three of mine later on.

2. "Trade till I come. . . . And the first came saying Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds." The servants did the trading and used the money, not for themselves but for the master; the money was still the master's, and the earnings of the money.

The first class contains only one kind of contract—*mutuum*; by which I become owner of your three loaves, and therefore must presently give you three of mine.

The second class contains endless different contracts: all those in which money is entrusted to be used on our behalf by someone else who can make profitable use of it. Benedict XIV says these contracts, which are often possible, are a manifold means for preserving and developing human intercourse and benefiting everyone by profitable trade and industry.

These contracts, he says, are absolutely different from a *mutuum*, a simple loan of the first kind.

In these contracts the money traded with belongs to the investor, and is in the business at the investor's risk, and profit; whereas, in the first case the borrower is dealing with his own money at his own risk.

A few years ago a priest asked me to name any contract that is a *mutuum* in Benedict XIV's sense. And I could not. I had not then realized that to him a *mutuum* is an exchange.

But now it seems to me clear that the pawnbroker's lending is the typical *mutuum*. His customers want money for their own use. He does not think they have gone away to use his money on his behalf in the enterprise he has sanctioned. He knows it is *their* money; he is not interested in how they use it. *His* money will be the money they bring back when redeeming their pledge.

Bankers and directors of companies have always to remember that they are dealing with their depositors' money or their shareholders' money.

But the man who borrows from the pawnbroker knows



that he is not spending the pawnbroker's money, but his own.

In English, this distinction has been obscured and hidden from us by the fact that the word "loan" is ambiguous. When a "loan" is asked for by a business firm, or a government, or a town, the money is wanted either for some development or for tiding over some difficulty in the life of the going concern. There is always money coming in to keep it going, either profits or rates or taxes; and the borrowers want me to put in my money and help them into a better position; so that it is worth their while to pay me interest until they redeem the loan, or else pay me perpetual annuities.

The point is that all this can be explained to me, and I entrust my money to them for that purpose and no other; not for anyone to use at his own sweet will. This means that it is still my money, and is being used according to my will. And because it is mine, I can sell my share in that loan to someone else. If the going concern fails, my money is lost to me. And what it earns, it earns for me.

Contrast this with the man who goes to a pawnbroker for a "loan." His whole intention is to get money for his own use, money of his own, to be used like the rest of his property at his own will. And certainly the pawnbroker does not say to himself: That man has got my money to use according to my instructions.

We call this also a loan; although in the first case the lender still owns the money and has entrusted its use to whom he would; whereas, in the other case, the borrower has the free use and control of the money, which he now owns.

Once we realize that the *mutuum*-borrower is now using his own money, we see that natural law forbids our charging him anything for using his own money. And we see, as Benedict XIV says, that it is no excuse to say I charge not excessive rates but moderate, not a great sum, but small; and the man is no pauper but rich; and he will use the money very profitably to increase his wealth. None of those is a reason why he should pay you for using his own money. Are you not ashamed to ask it? (plus aliquid exigere non veretur).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Denzinger, 1476.

## V. EXTRINSIC TITLES TO COMPENSATION : LUCRUM CESSANS.

You will say, the fact remains that he has the use of the money and I have not; he is making profits with it not for me but for himself, and I cannot make any until he repays the loan. There you nearly touch solid ground. For the Church recognizes that in many cases your lending involves collateral hardships to the lender, against which the borrower ought to safeguard you. You may rightly expect him to pay for your inconveniences. But you must not ask him to pay for his own conveniences that the loan has brought him.

Theologians discovered that principle of compensation for your hardships from noticing instances: as when the money you lend ceases to earn profits for you; when for lack of it you incur a loss; when there is a real risk that you will never get it back; or that it will cost you extraordinary trouble to get it back. But the principle, like all principles, is broader and deeper than any list of instances.

Benedict says these extrinsic titles may at times happen to accompany a *mutuum*-loan, and they provide a wholly just and lawful reason for requiring something over and above the amount lent.

St. Thomas says you may bargain for the borrower to make good any losses you incur by lending the money; but not for the loss of profits you might be earning with that money; because you cannot sell what you have not got and what many a chance may stop your getting. On the parallel problem of keeping a creditor waiting for his money and thereby hindering his making profits from that money, St. Thomas says that a suitable compensation must be paid for what the hope of profit was worth.<sup>9</sup> That was a question of restitution for the wrong you did by withholding his money. And, naturally, the duty of restitution extends to every loss you have caused him by your injustice.

But here we are dealing with your debt on account of the *mutuum*,<sup>10</sup> *cui per æquale iam satis est factum*, and your debt on account of extrinsic titles, *eosdemque ipsimet universim naturæ mutui minime innatos et*

<sup>9</sup> 2, 2, 62, art. 4, ad 2.

<sup>10</sup> Benedict XIV, *Vix pervenit*, Denzinger, 1476, 7.

*intrinsecos*. Now in the *mutuum*, the lender's money has become yours; and this transfer, universally and of its very nature, means that the lender cannot now trade with that money, whereas you, the borrower, can. That fact is not extrinsic to the loan but wholly intrinsic. Therefore, St. Thomas says bluntly "he cannot bargain for compensation for the loss that is seen in the fact that he is not earning profits with the money."<sup>11</sup>

In contradiction to St. Thomas and Benedict XIV, let Fr. L. Watt, S.J., state a view that is prevalent among modern theologians:—

Whoever lends money to another normally foregoes the profit which his money would have gained for him when invested.

Normally? No; but, always and necessarily, by giving up the ownership of the money he gives up all power of profiting by that money.

Fr. Watt goes on:—

In other words, the title of *lucrum cessans* is normally present for every lender to-day, so that he can claim compensation in the form of interest for his loss of profit.<sup>12</sup>

Are we to believe that the loss of profit which inheres in the very nature of every *mutuum*, arises nowadays from some extrinsic circumstance?

Again, shall we say I justify *lucrum* by *lucrum cessans*? for that is the impression the ordinary reader takes from the argument. Shall I draw a steady income from lending a *mutuum*, and call that income compensation for my losses?

And is not the right line of approach to ask in each case: Is this loan a *mutuum* or an utterly different contract?

Is the money I have lent still mine? or does the borrower own it?

Have I provided money to be used for some undertaking and for nothing else? or can he use it as he wills?

Does my hope of getting a return depend on the success or failure of the undertaking? or is it a personal debt which he must in any case repay?

<sup>11</sup> 2, 2, 78, 2, ad 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Ethics of Interest*, p. 15.

If he loses the money, do I bear the loss? or does he?

Once we have found out who owns the money, we know who can profit by that money. The lender can if he still owns it. But if he no longer owns it, natural justice allows him only the repayment of the amount lent, and compensation for his losses; but no profit whatever.

I believe that the real difficulty is to see in individual cases which kind of loan is before us. Benedict XIV was perfectly clear about the dividing line in principle—that the borrower who receives money to use as his own, owns that money and is the only one who can profit by it; while the lender who provides money for fostering, in any way, man's wealth and welfare, justly draws profit from his money's earnings. But Pope Benedict did not pronounce in individual cases:—

About the contract which has raised these new controversies, we decide nothing at present. Likewise we make no pronouncement on the other contracts concerning which theologians and canonists hold conflicting opinions. . . . Those who think their powers and wisdom qualify them to give an opinion on these questions must keep far from extremes, which are always wrong. For there are some so strict in judging these matters that they denounce as unlawful and akin to usury any profit whatever drawn from money. Others again are so indulgent and easy that they think every gain is clear from the guilt of usury.<sup>13</sup>

Those two extremes are still with us to-day. They still agree in lumping all contracts together. When a man is in fact putting his money out to develop human wealth, one school tells him that all profit from money lent is usury—as if he had lent a *mutuum*. The other school tells him to call his profits compensation for *lucrum cessans*—again as if his investment were a *mutuum*.

Whereas the real justification of his profits is that he is the owner of that money which, in others' hands, is now the material or the instrument whereby wealth is being developed.

Surely what we need to do is to consider many kinds of contract one by one, until it becomes easy to see in each case whether the loaned money now belongs to the

<sup>13</sup> *Vix pervenit*, §6, §8.

borrower or to the lender. For on that distinction every decision depends.

And, to escape the feeling of being tangled in mere technical terms, we need to keep in mind the moral question: Is this man using his wealth to get a grip on another's wealth? or is he putting out his own wealth to take its share in the conserving and developing of human wealth that was considered at the beginning of this paper? Is he saying: "I give you what money you need, and I have a lien on all you possess for its repayment in due time," or "I will risk my money with yours in your undertaking, hoping that it will profit us both"?

## A CODE OF CATHOLIC ACTION<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. HERBERT KELDANY.

**E**VERYONE who has looked into the vast collection of Papal pronouncements which have been made on the subject of Catholic Action during the last few years must have been confused if not bewildered by their profusion. Until recently there was little to be read about them in English and many must have abandoned the unequal struggle with foreign tongues and lengthy bibliographies on the plea that there is and can be very little new to be said about Catholic Action.

Preparation must come before action in the order of execution. Before England as a whole, or a particular town, or parish, can be won for Christ the material conditions which will affect the apostolate must be studied; they constitute an objective fact which will of itself entail considerable study; not less important is the subjective consideration of the means, both material and spiritual, at the disposal of the would-be apostles, but far and away the most important item is the method to be employed. Fortunately for the impatient the study of the *method* of Catholic Action is thus the first requisite, and the success of Fr. Martindale's version of the famous *Manual of Catholic Action*, which was published some years ago by Monsignor Civardi for use in seminaries of Italy, indicates that a beginning is being made by the more serious elements in this country.

The *Manual* as we have it in English contains only the first half of the original work; because the second was of narrower interest, covering as it did the practical problems relevant to Italy, only the theoretical part has been translated, but even this bears the impression of its destination for Italian conditions. That is not to say the book is useless, it has been translated into seven different languages and is likely to remain the most widely-known handbook on the theory of Catholic Action, for it is invariably recommended in Rome; but since it is admitted that what is practicable in one country may not be so suited to another there is no reason why other applications should not be studied with equal profit. Monsignor Civardi recently stated something of the kind in an important article in a special number of the *Osservatore Romano*. "The permanence of the present system of Catholic Action is sometimes questioned. If we consider the mere organization and the immediate programme of activity then there should be no surprise if these were altered; for these are accidental to Catholic Action which is inevitably

<sup>1</sup> *L'Action Catholique*. Textes Pontificaux classés et commentés par l'Abbé E. Guerry, Vicaire Général de Grenoble. Desclée de Brouwer. 18 francs.



an approximation since it must adapt itself to conditions and needs of different times and places. But the fundamental characteristics of Catholic Action which Pius XI has defined and illustrated from day to day are immutable."

These words are a valuable guide for the perplexed who, because they see certain systems or methods working successfully in different conditions, are impatient of the slow evolution of organized and centralized methods in this country. Quite apart from the many difficulties inherent to the scattered nature of our Catholic population, these worthy people do not seem to realize that the movements they admire have roots which go back to long before the War. To take the case of the now well-known Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne, although it was celebrating its tenth anniversary last summer and looks as though it might have been started in response to the Pope's cry for "working-class apostles" embodied in *Quadragesimo Anno*, this vigorous and most interesting movement has its roots in the determination taken by its founder nearly fifty years ago to devote his life to the working people among whom he was born. He was already at work in a small way before the War, and he wrote his great *Manuel de la J.O.C.* while in prison for his activities on behalf of his beloved workers during the German occupation of Belgium. The case is similar in Italy where the organization of an active group of Catholic laity dates back to the loss of the Papal States in 1870. This historical note of spontaneity, of growth from specific circumstances is not sufficiently stressed, yet it does not in any way detract from the authoritative lead given by the Pope who has made it his business to foster and encourage similar movements throughout Christendom; on the contrary, it would seem to be a strong argument for the view that the spread of the *apostolate of the laity* is one of the most comforting signs of strength within the Church at a time when it is customary to look to the future with gloomy foreboding. Also it forms the best argument for adaptability. Since the scope of this lay apostolate is to co-operate with the hierarchy in its needs, it is obvious that the form or method which it develops must vary according to the conditions of the particular dioceses, so there can be no cast-iron rule. This is clear from the slightest perusal of the various constitutions that have been published and from the numberless specialized organizations which have earned the approval of authority, although they seem at first sight to cut across conventional grouping.

Although M. l'Abbé Guerry is writing more particularly for French readers there is a less particular note about his work which should do much to make it known far beyond the limits of French reading public. To call the first part of this work, which is reminiscent of Cardinal Gasparri's Catechism in its three-fold arrangement, a code, is not an exaggeration, for in it the author has digested all the more important pronouncements on the many aspects of Catholic Action, thereby gathering within the space of a hundred pages the precious gems which

hitherto had to be quarried from the most diverse seams. The result, embodied in some 170 sections all of universal application, makes the teaching of the reigning pontiff on this subject stand out as a complete spiritual and social foundation for a Christian society in contemporary life. A long familiarity with this scattered literature, while giving some idea of the comprehensiveness of the outlook, had failed to make one student, at least, realize the impressive proportions of the whole. It is so easy to take principles for granted and to discount the clarifications latent in repetitions of similar speeches that it comes sometimes as a surprise to find that the mature form of the embryo of a few years ago is quite a giant to-day. Certainly one of the primary results of studying the first part of this book must be the conviction that Pius XI will go down to posterity as the promoter of the *lay apostolate*, not so much because he started the movement as because he encouraged it for the health of the Church.

Some years ago there was published in France a small Catechism of Catholic Action from the pen of Mgr. Fontanelle. Brief and precise answers to certain obvious questions were given in colloquial form, sufficient to introduce the reader to the then growing doctrine of the lay apostolate. This pamphlet was turned down as unsuitable for publication in England. However that decision may have come about it is to be hoped that some enterprising publisher will be found who will sponsor an English version of what I have called the Code of Catholic Action. Here are the *ipsissima verba* digested by an expert, whose office of Vicar General of the diocese of Grenoble has given him a special qualification for the selection of practical passages from letters and allocutions which have not hitherto been codified. Politics, relations with other associations, money matters, the Press, all these are dealt with in a small compass and should interest many besides priests; indeed, the original book is specifically dedicated to the ordinary Catholic layman. But, of course, it will be most prized by the expert, or the would-be expert, and should be most popular in seminaries and study-clubs where the foundations of future developments are being laid.

The second half of the book follows the same arrangement as the first, each section of the original ten chapters is amplified and illustrated by practical commentary which benefits from the wide experience of the author who is conversant with the latest developments abroad as well as in his native France. There is here a breadth of view and a realist atmosphere which distinguishes this work from many of the more theoretical books which have appeared of late years; but there is no striving for effect, facts and words are left to create their own impression; history and the latest statistics are always used to corroborate an argument. It would seem that the book has been put together from the notes of a course; so much practical value have they that we seem to be privileged to attend the lectures of M. Guerry.

His modesty causes him to relegate to a footnote some of the most valuable hints. We will extract one to prove our point. On page 332, after pointing out that the object of organization is neither unification, centralization, nor juxtaposition, he stresses the need for unity of mind, will, and heart, called for by the Pope, and then adds in a footnote on co-ordination of societies: "This is the form which Catholic Action has taken in France. Article 1 of the statutes of the Action Catholique Française runs as follows: *The A.C.F. is a co-ordination of 'œuvres' already in existence with a view to organizing the activities of all Catholics in conformity with the pontifical directions and to procuring the co-operation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy.*

"This definition," he continues, "is worthy of comment. It places the accent not so much on a call to the apostolate as on its organization. This is tantamount to saying that there is no need for new 'œuvres' to be created, since all that is indicated is co-ordination among those already existing. In practice this co-ordination takes various forms. In the national plane it has consisted in the formation of a link between the leading 'œuvres' and also between them and the bishops. As in other nations the societies which form Catholic Action are divided between four large groups of men, women, boys and girls, according to the suggestions of the Holy Father. But within each of these groups there exist a variety of smaller associations; thus the Catholic National Federation is the union of men's diocesan leagues, originally founded for the defence of religious liberties. The Feminine League of Catholic Action is composed to-day of the fusion of two large federations of women: the league of Patriotic Frenchwomen and the league of Catholic Frenchwomen. The Catholic Association of French Youth is the body which co-ordinates all the specialized movements for young men, while the girls are linked together by a Secretariat for all diocesan federations of Young Women. The same need for co-ordination was felt in the plane of the diocese and the parish. In the diocese the matter is in the control of the diocesan *Direction des Œuvres*: this is largely assisted by the Diocesan Committee for Catholic Action, which groups the heads of the leading associations and is kept busy by the publication of a bulletin, the organization of congresses, and a general meeting from time to time. A similar arrangement on the parochial plane will largely facilitate the work of the former Committee. . . . One of the more noteworthy results has been the formation of leagues of working people, both men and women, and the increasingly marked orientation of the *Fédération Nationale Catholique* towards united civic action. Lastly, it is already possible to foresee the growth of specialized movements for adults; a number of associations similar to our guilds, are slowly introducing a Christian spirit in the strictly professional circles."

When it is realized that this quotation forms the footnote to a section devoted to the question: "How are the rights of the

Bishops to be conciliated with an organization which organizes Catholic Action on a national scale transcending diocesan arrangements?" something of the proportions of the Abbé Guerry's work may be realized. It is difficult to resist the temptation to quote important passages from the 300 pages of valuable commentary.

Not content with the copious references to extant collections of documents the author has seen fit to append in a third part the texts of the encyclical *Il Fermo Proposito* and some six letters on Catholic Action written by Pius XI to various Archbishops and Primate. These form the basis of the teaching which future generations will study with increasing care; to have the Latin originals at hand will be most helpful despite the valuable translation of the leading ones put out last year by the Catholic Truth Society in the pamphlet entitled *The Pope and Catholic Action*.

The well-prepared index, a rare adjunct in French books, is the last of the many inducements which should encourage all who read French to obtain this relatively inexpensive work. Others will look forward to the translation into English of at least the first part of M. Guerry's most valuable contribution to the literature on Catholic Action.

## HOMILETICS

### *Eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost.*

*"The testimony of Christ was confirmed in you, so that nothing is wanting to you in any grace" (1 Cor. i. 6-7).*

The scene is our Lord's "own city" of Capharnaum, and He has just returned across the sea of Galilee after one of His missions of mercy. As soon as it is known that He is back, people flock to the house to listen to His teaching, and there are Pharisees and doctors of the law as well, come from all parts to see what they can find out about the new Teacher. The story is more fully told by St. Mark and St. Luke than in the Gospel which we read to-day, and we can fill it out from them. Some people come along with a paralysed man on a stretcher. They cannot get in, but they are not to be beaten. They carry the man up to the roof and let him down at the feet of our Lord. One can imagine them all; the crowd, the critical doctors of the law, the friends, the sick man himself, on the stretch with anxiety or with curiosity.

Our Lord speaks. "Be of good heart, son, thy sins are forgiven thee." What bewilderment, what disappointment, the words must have caused in hearers looking for a work of bodily healing. But our Lord had a purpose. He had put spiritual healing before bodily for a definite reason. When "some of the scribes said within themselves: He blasphemeth," our Lord read their hearts, and His answer came at once: "Why do you think evil in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say, thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, arise and walk?" And at once, to confirm the miracle of spiritual healing He worked the miracle of bodily healing—"Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house." And the paralysed man got up, healed, and "the multitude seeing it feared, and glorified God, Who had given such power to men."

Manifestly we learn from the story of this miracle that the first things must be put first, also that the first things are not always those that seem to the human eye to be so. The spiritual is more than the bodily, the eternal more than the temporal. The paralysed man's first need, as also the first need of all of us, was God; health and strength only as they would serve God's glory and man's closer union with Him. In this case, the bodily healing that followed the spiritual served directly to vindicate God's power to heal the soul. It confounded the unbelieving Pharisees and lawyers; it confirmed the multitude in the fear of God and in the praise of Him "Who had given such power to men." "The testimony of Christ was confirmed"

in that paralysed man, so that "nothing was wanting" to him "in any grace."

Moreover, this power to heal was a power mediated to man through Man—Christ our Lord, God and Man. The people praised God, "Who had given such power to men," speaking truly so far as they knew, but speaking, unconsciously, far more truly than they, in fact, knew. For He Whom they spoke of as in the category of "men" was, indeed, Man, and also far more—God and Man. And, further than that, He has exercised the power to delegate to mere man those same powers at which the multitude feared and for which they praised God. Never since, has God refused to work miracles of bodily healing at the prayer of His saints, in answer to prayer over their relics, at their shrines. And never since has the spring of spiritual healing, flowing normally through the channel of the Sacraments, failed to work healing to the sick soul and, indeed, resurrection to the soul dead in sin. Truly "nothing is wanting" to us "in any grace," to confirm us in the fear of God and in His praise.

Let us notice, too, that healing of soul and of body reached the paralysed man not only through our Divine Lord as Man, and to-day reaches the sick soul not only through His priesthood, administering the Sacraments. Others had their share in the work, and still have. "And behold, they brought to Him one sick of the palsy," St. Matthew tells us, and the other Evangelists add that "they sought means to bring him in," and when they could not get through the crowd they dragged him up to the roof and let him down. Here were faith, zeal, persistence, on the part of the man's friends, no effort of theirs should be wanting to bring the sick man into touch with the Divine Healer. And our Lord, Who could quite as well have healed the man, as He healed the centurion's servant, from far off, made his friends partakers with Him in that great work of spiritual and corporal mercy. A privilege indeed for them, and a privilege still extended to us to-day.

Do we value it as we might? All around us are sick souls, souls even dead to grace. Often it is, humanly speaking, impossible for them to get back; they seem to have lost all power of spiritual movement, even the power to desire it. Often a tactful word, even a sympathetic interest, above all the power of example, will bring them to our Lord's feet and get them the grace of renewed life. But our friendship must cost us something; we must be prepared to face and overcome difficulties, as did this sick man's friends. Let us remember that the salvation of an eternal soul may be at stake, and that if our opportunity is to be measured by eternity so also is our responsibility. "The testimony of Christ was confirmed in you, so that nothing is wanting to you in any grace." We shall fall grievously short of the graces given us, if the testimony of Christ is not confirmed in our own lives and in our actions towards our fellow creatures who need Him as we need Him ourselves.



*Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost.*

*"Come ye to the marriage" (St. Matt. xxii. 4).*

The parable which we read in to-day's Gospel warns us of the terrible punishments that must befall those who obstinately reject the mercies offered them by their Creator or defy the God who would fain be their salvation. It was addressed to the chief priests and pharisees who were about to compass our Lord's death, in the course of His final preaching in which He was making a last effort to save them from themselves. It takes its sombre colour from the circumstances, and recalls the scenes of tumult, bloodshed and violent death that pervade the Old Testament story of revolting mankind's rejection of its Creator. The terrible story was soon to culminate in the horror of Calvary, and here our Lord gives a last warning, makes a last appeal, to those who would reject Him.

"The kingdom of Heaven is likened to a king who made a marriage for his son; and he sent his servants to call them that were invited, and they would not come." Again he sent the invitation, and this time the servants were first maltreated and then killed. Whereupon the king was angry, sent his armies, destroyed the murderers and burnt their city. Manifestly this was no mere matter of declining an invitation. Evidently the king was a paramount lord, whose invitation was both a command and a high honour. Nor did the guests merely not want to come; they were subjects in a state of enmity against their lord, hating him, determined not only to reject his gracious kindness, but to do so with every extreme of insult and outrage. Their terrible fate was of their own doing, of their own deliberate and determined doing. By all the conditions of the case, they themselves made any other end impossible.

Next, the parable goes on to give us a second and equally terrible warning. In place of his appointed guests, the king sent out his servants into the highways to call to the marriage any they might find "both bad and good," and so the "marriage was filled with guests." But one among them had not a wedding garment, to whom the king said, "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having on a wedding garment?" The man was dumb, and the king caused him to be cast forth "into the exterior darkness" where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Manifestly here was another rejection, and a contumacious rejection of the king's gratuitous kindness; a miscellaneous crowd gathered haphazard would not have wedding garments; they had been provided by the giver of the feast, and to appear at the table without the garment provided was not only a disobedience, but a gross and deliberate affront against one who was both benefactor and sovereign lord. Again, the terrible fate that results is due to the obstinacy of the offender.

We need to take seriously to heart the two warnings in this

parable; we should never so think of the mercies of God and the easiness of salvation, as to forget the judgments of God and the terrible alternative which we bring upon ourselves if we neglect His salvation. The times in which we live give a terrible appositeness to the first warning. The spirit of anti-Christ is abroad; the anti-God propaganda finds its way everywhere; the messengers of the Lord are persecuted, exiled, put to death; the marriage feast is spurned with every manifestation of insult and blasphemy. Let us, as the Holy Father calls us to do, pray ever more earnestly for the delivery of poor mankind from this terror that wanders through the world for the ruin of souls; let us be on the watch against its snares; let us be ever more careful as to our own loyalty to our King and to His chosen messengers who bring us His gracious messages and call us to be His very friends and guests.

The second warning is very personal, to each and all. We have been called to the marriage feast, and only one thing has been asked of us—one thing, offered to us freely, which we have but to take. The wedding garment of sanctifying grace, bestowed on us in our baptism and renewed every time we approach the Sacrament of Penance. To forfeit it is to banish ourselves from the wedding feast, and at the worst and last to lose for ever the sight of our God and our only good. Yet only the perverse and obstinate refusal of God's grace can forfeit it. How easy the good Giver of the feast makes it for us—He provides the feast, He provides the grace we need to partake of it worthily. Yet we can lose it all; by our own fault, by our own doing. Let us treasure our state of grace beyond all things, and pray daily, "Lord, give me the grace to live in Thy grace and to die in Thy grace, and never to separate myself from Thee again by grievous sin."

Our Lord meant this parable as a warning; a terrible warning in terrible circumstances. Yet, so long as we heed the warning we may also look upon the other side. Of His boundless mercy the King, our Creator and our God, calls us to His banquet, which is none other than the nuptial feast of His own Son. He calls the whole world, offering peace in place of enmity; He calls each of us from the highways "both bad and good," to make us His very own, in His Church, the Bride of the Lamb. And of the consummated Heavenly marriage-feast He gives us the foretaste of which we can partake every day, in the Sacrificial Banquet of His Altar—*pignus futuræ gloriæ*, the pledge of future glory. And not only this; our present strength in all our need—"the armour of faith and the shield of good will, the extinction of our vices, the increase in us of charity and patience and of all virtues; the strong defence against our enemies visible and invisible, and the bond of union that shall never be broken with our one true God." To this grace God calls us all; may we all respond to His call! "Blessed are they that are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb."

*Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost.*

*"Deal with us according to the multitude of Thy mercies, and give glory to Thy Name, O Lord"* (Daniel iii. 42, 43).

Our Lord worked two miracles very similar in their method and circumstances. One was in the first year of His ministry, in Cana of Galilee, when He healed, without coming near the sick person, who was at Capharnaum, the dying son of "a certain ruler." The other was in the second year, in Capharnaum, when He healed, also from a distance away, a centurion's servant. The contrasted attitudes of the two men, the ruler and the centurion, and the method of our Lord's response to each, are full of instruction for ourselves. The centurion was a Gentile, but he was already looking towards the true religion; he had befriended the Jews of Capharnaum and built them a synagogue. So when his servant fell ill the Jews recommended him to Jesus, and Jesus said "I will come and heal him." Even so, the centurion could hardly believe the good news; he went to meet Jesus, with the beautiful words which we repeat thrice before our Communions, "Lord, I am not worthy." And Jesus said, "I have not found so great faith, not even in Israel."

The ruler who came to our Lord in Cana, on the other hand, was manifestly a Jew, and a Jew of position and education. When he came and begged Jesus to heal his dying son, our Lord read his heart. "Unless you see signs and wonders, you believe not." It seems as if he had paid no attention to our Lord till he wanted something from Him; nor was he going to accept His teaching unless he could get some "signs and wonders" of his own to prove it. It was the attitude of the typical ruling class among the Jews, notwithstanding all the lessons of their own past history as God's chosen people. "Unless you see signs and wonders, you believe not."

Yet see how gently and lovingly our Lord deals with this ruler. The poor man is distraught with anxiety for his son and takes no notice of Jesus' rebuke; he simply prays more insistently, "Lord, come down before that my son die." Our Lord lets it all pass, and gives the man the boon he craves: "Go thy way; thy son liveth." Our Lord's generosity won the man right over; he "believed the word which Jesus said to him, and went his way." He found that it had happened just as Jesus had said, and "himself believed and his whole house." Wonderfully indeed does this miracle illustrate God's dealings with His own wandering and faithless people, as is foreshadowed in the beautiful prayer of Daniel from which the Introit of to-day's Mass is taken. "We have not hearkened to Thy commandments, nor have we observed nor done as Thou hadst commanded us, that it might go well with us. Deal with us according to the multitude of Thy mercies, and give glory to Thy Name, O Lord."

How sadly like that ruler we are—we who have the Faith and the boundless graces it brings—so slow to come to our Lord, to

hear His word, to follow Him, until some trouble comes that affects us and those near us. Then we are ready enough to have recourse to Him and to ask His help. How often we have experienced His generosity in the past when He has answered our prayers in spite of the lack of faith, the earth-bound mentality, for which He has had occasion to rebuke us. Yet our sheer need, our cry for help, has moved His Sacred Heart to come to our rescue. His love must surely move us henceforth to give Him our faith and our love in return, to take Him, as at length did the ruler whose son He restored to life, not only as our Helper in time of need, but as our Messiah, the Son of God, the Lord and Master of our whole life and being.

The sequel to this miracle ends the story: the ruler "himself believed, and his whole house." Grace, and even more some signal, unexpected grace, must issue not only in a new and livelier personal faith and self-surrender, but also in zeal to spread the faith and knowledge of the Giver of all. How many opportunities we might make of spreading God's kingdom if we took advantage of the incidents that arise in our social and neighbourly life. Be the incident some great grace, like an unexpected recovery from a grave illness, or something apparently trivial about which talk goes round, there is so often the opportunity, if we would only look for it, for saying the tactful word or forming the personal contact that may help some fellow-Catholic nearer to God, or bring back one who has strayed away, or influence some non-Catholic towards the true fold. Gratitude for the graces we have received is no real gratitude unless it reaches out to others, to get further graces for them and for God's glory.

Let us remember particularly how many there are in our own country outside the Fold, "Gentiles" like the centurion of the other miracle, who put us to shame by their earnestness in seeking after God, their readiness to believe, their humility, their zeal, when once the light breaks upon them. The generosity of our Lord towards ourselves, despite our little faith and our small correspondence with the full light we have received, answering our prayers in time of need, should surely inspire us with a great generosity towards Him, and towards our fellow-creatures whom also He so ardently longs to help. He has indeed dealt with us not according to our deserts but "according to the multitude of His mercies." "Give glory to Thy Name," O Lord, not only in Thy wonderful works and mercies but also in our grateful hearts and in our thankful zeal for Thy glory.

*Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost.*

*"Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors" (St. Matt. vi. 12).*

Our Lord tells us in to-day's Gospel of a king who found that a subordinate—evidently a person of position and substance—was behind in the payments he had to make to the extent of ten

thousand talents—an enormous sum, equivalent to some millions of pounds to-day. So the king resolved to sell him up, as we should say to-day, and realize all his assets till the debt should be paid. The man pleaded for mercy and promised to work till he could pay everything off. The king evidently believed in his sincerity, and not only did not sell him up, but actually forgave him the whole debt. It was a great and magnificent act of sheer generosity, such as God shows in His dealings with ourselves, not only saving us from the complete ruin we have brought upon ourselves by sin, but even forgiving us the debt itself. Even the temporal debt still due upon forgiven sin He offers to remit through all the treasures of merit open to us in His Church if we will only avail ourselves of them.

But the servant was unworthy of the king's generosity. He had a subordinate who owed him a miserable little sum of a hundred pence—equal to about three pounds to-day—and this subordinate he promptly and mercilessly sold up. Small wonder that when the king was told of this, he was angry and withdrew his forgiveness of the first man's great debt. "Shouldst thou not then have had compassion also on thy fellow-servant, even as I had compassion on thee?" And then our Lord adds, plainly and directly, "So also shall thy heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."

There is no getting away from these plain words. Moreover, they are placed in our own mouths by our Lord Himself, in the prayer He gave us when He said, "Thus shall you pray"—the Lord's Prayer. It is the pattern prayer, the prayer upon which we have to model our lives, and whenever we say it we say, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." We are not to expect God's forgiveness except in the measure in which we ourselves forgive; the forgiveness must be complete and must cover all, and it must be, as our Lord says in the parable, "from your hearts." "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you." "Forgive and you shall be forgiven." "Lord, how often shall my brother offend against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times? Jesus saith to him: I say not to thee till seven times, but till seventy times seven times."

Undoubtedly this is a very difficult commandment, because it is such a direct challenge to all the instincts and propensities of our fallen nature. And further it is difficult because of the honest perplexities of conscience that may arise in connection with it. It may sometimes be a necessity and a duty to insist on the payment of something that is due to us, especially when it is withheld through gross injustice and to the detriment of others to whom we in turn have duties. It may be a duty to withstand traducers of our good name, and not forgive the traducer in the sense of letting him accomplish his evil purpose. But no such difficulties absolve us from the duty of charity—of forgiveness in its fundamental sense. "Justice and peace" can be recon-

ciled, and must be. Says St. Francis of Sales: "We must tranquilly seek the reparation of the wrong received and repel all the bad feelings that rise up in our hearts against the wrongdoer. Are we not all fellow-sinners, fellow-debtors, and where would any one of us be if we all received our deserts?"

A difficult commandment indeed, in fact, impossible to fallen human nature unaided. But not impossible, however difficult, to him who prays. Let the case be as aggravated and as inexcusable as can be conceived, put it before God the moment it arises, keep on praying so long as it lasts, make acts of resignation, petitions for guidance as to what to do for the best, prayers that God's will, and God's will alone, may be done, and we shall not fail in our duty of forgiveness to "them that trespass against us." Some way or other, in His own way, though very likely not in ours, God will solve the problem and bring good out of evil. And let us be honest with ourselves and ask ourselves how often such really difficult cases do occur. Does not the unforgiving spirit, the breach of charity, very often arise out of mean and miserable little incidents about which it is discreditable to both sides to quarrel? Truly we often need to remind ourselves of the words we so often have upon our lips: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us."

Let us never forget the positive, the upbuilding value of the forgiving spirit, a value which is the greater as the forgiveness is more difficult. It is easy enough to be charitable when all goes well; it is the difficult charity that gains merit and moulds us to the likeness of Christ. Says Fr. de Caussade to a correspondent continually beset by trials and vexations from those around her, "It is pure gold you are amassing, and the size of your hoard will depend only on yourself." Everything that we have to put up with, both from without and from the incessant, wearying uprising against our real will, of unkind and unforgiving thoughts within, is material for the upbuilding of our own better love of God and, for His sake, of our neighbour. We have but to cast ourselves upon Him, and He will give us the grace so to forgive our neighbour that we shall ourselves be forgiven.



## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

Sanctity resides in the will; but faith, which is the foundation of sanctity, resides in the intellect. The spiritual life is supernatural wisdom; and wisdom implies the information and activity of the intellect. The right ordering and instruction of the intellect is, therefore, of primary importance in the spiritual life; it is the single eye which makes the whole body lightsome. The spiritual life is due to the energizing in us of the Holy Spirit as principal agent and of the Humanity of Christ as instrumental cause. They will operate if we plant no obstacles, are submissive and receptive. But in fact we put many obstacles, not merely by the malice of our wills but also by the ignorance of our minds; both faculties suffer from the Fall. Hence again the importance of true intellectual formation to the spiritual life.

This intellectual formation is not merely a scientific knowledge of the ways of prayer; although this is presupposed, if not in the soul seeking perfection, at least in its director. Rather it is primarily a living knowledge to be gained in prayer of the relation of the soul to the Humanity of Christ and the Holy Ghost. A scientific treatise on prayer requires a meditation book as its sequel, to make practical application of its principles. *In the Likeness of Christ*, by the Rev. Edward Leen, C.S.Sp.,<sup>1</sup> is such a sequel to his very excellent *Progress through Mental Prayer*. The writer is convinced that we cannot put on Christ unless we know Him; and many do not put Him on precisely because they never fully know Him. He writes: "Christ's life in its actual historical aspect cannot be ours; but that life of His in its inner aspect—in what passed in His Heart, His imagination, in His soul and His will, in contact with human circumstances—that, in a certain measure, can be shared by us and therefore can, in a true sense, be ours. It is in the principles of His inner and outward reactions to the facts of life that there is established psychological contact between Christ and ourselves. It is in that contact we come to see that our individual experience is typified in the Gospel, and that the Gospel is reproduced, in its turn, in our own experience. Once this point has been reached, our hesitating and uncertain attempts to imitate Jesus become firmer and more assured, whilst, at the same time, the formative influence of His life on ours becomes more potent and efficacious." Thus we have in us the mind of

<sup>1</sup> Sheed & Ward. pp. xxiv., 361. 7s. 6d.  
229

Christ; and the result is a movement of circular causality (whatever certain Catholic philosophers may think of that phenomenon), the attempt to live by the Gospel giving greater understanding of the Gospel, and greater understanding of the Gospel giving greater facility to live by the Gospel. The book is in three parts. The first contains studies of our Lord in His Incarnation and the principal events of His hidden years, closing with one on St. Joseph. The second opens with a study of our Lady and goes on to consider our Lord's Humility, Tenderness to those who fail, The Triumph of Failure, The Gift of the Blessed Sacrament, and the Passion. The third deals with the Resurrection, the Sending of the Holy Ghost, the Secret of Life (suspending our life to the divine will), and the Way of Peace (living the supernatural life of divine charity). Each study is complete in itself, but the book builds up a scheme of thought, a developing manifestation of Christ. Those who have read Fr. Leen's earlier book will recognize in this one the same qualities of theological completeness, spiritual wisdom, prudence and persuasiveness.

As a very useful little scientific treatise on prayer, Fr. Vincent McNabb's *The Science of Prayer* may be recommended.<sup>2</sup> It is a revision of his *Oxford Conferences on Prayer*, which were published over thirty years ago. The writer treats of the nature and divisions of prayer, the theology and psychology of prayer, vocal, mental and liturgical prayer, the prayer of Christ, and hindrances to prayer. This is a subject on which Fr. McNabb is very well competent to speak; and he is following throughout the doctrine of St. Thomas.

*Songs in the Night*, by a Poor Clare Colettine,<sup>3</sup> is a difficult book for a humdrum person to review. It is not a book of poems written to while away sleepless hours. It is a book of mystical prayer written in prose; but it is a book of songs, since all mystical prayer is a song to God, and they are songs in the night, since contemplation is the dark night of the soul. The theme is God's love for the soul and the soul's love for God, as realized and sometimes felt by the contemplative soul in all the moods and movements and elements of the contemplative life. The style speeds on with a certain rhythm and glow that befit the joy of a song. One needs to be in tune with the singer, in imagination, to catch the true feeling and meaning of her mystical thinking. The little book has four sections: The Song of a Soul in the Place of her Pilgrimage; A Little Book of Pure Joy; Anima Consolata; The Pentecost of the Loving Soul. As striking qualities of the book I would instance the very refined quality of the love that is its theme, the steady, but unobtrusive inculcation of the worth of a life of renunciation, and the brave effort to put into adequate expression things really ineffable.

<sup>2</sup> St. Dominic's Press, Ditchling. pp. xi., 102. 5s.

<sup>3</sup> Preface by the Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh. Sheed & Ward. pp. viii., 217. 6s.

The writer's familiarity with the Sacred Scriptures is very pleasing. The author of her predilection is the pseudo-Dionysius.

*Ordeals of Souls* is a new series of letters of the famous spiritual writer, P. de Caussade, S.J.<sup>4</sup> It continues the series published some time ago under the title of *Spiritual Letters of Père de Caussade*,<sup>5</sup> and will be followed shortly by a third volume. All have been translated by the skilful pen of the late Algar Thorold. As is well known to all who have the least acquaintance with de Caussade, the leading idea of the spiritual life, as he viewed it, was abandonment to Divine Providence; he worked that idea into all his guidance of souls; and it enabled him at a time of difficulty for the true formulation of spiritual principles to steer safely between the Scylla of Jansenism and the Charybdis of Quietism. The present series of letters is arranged in two parts, the first dealing with spiritual sterility, impotency and aversion, the second with sufferings, afflictions and hardships. It will, therefore, be of much use to all those who are treading the way of renunciation; their various difficulties are here met, both the inner difficulties of dryness, scruples and spiritual anxieties and the exterior ones of pain, sickness, antipathy, vexation.

A further stage in the new edition of Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints* has been at last reached with the almost simultaneous publication of the volumes for May and October.<sup>6</sup> Fr. Thurston and his collaborators, Miss Leeson (for the volumes of the first six months) and Mr. D. Attwater (for the remaining volumes), have naturally an onerous task to perform, requiring infinite care and much research and reading. Butler has to be abridged where his lives are too long for the scope of the present volume, and he has to be recast to bring him into harmony of style with the lives generally. The present reviewer is not of those who dislike this treatment of a revered English writer; but he is well aware of a certain inevitable loss in the pruning of the hortatory sections of the original. New lives have to be added, of saints and *beati* who have become honoured since Butler wrote; and these double the material of the original. Useful features of this new edition are the lives of the English Martyrs as they occur, and the accurate criticism of the ancient lives, apparitions, etc., and the neat bibliographies giving references to the best works of modern scholarship. I would consider that this new edition of Butler is in every way to be highly commended. It gives us all the lives of saints that are of any importance; it is up-to-date (the October volume includes, in an Appendix, B. Antony M. Claret, beatified in 1934); and, by the sources of scholarship that it has followed, it puts at the service of English readers a thoroughly authentic hagiographical collection. Each

<sup>4</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. pp. vii., 117. 5s.

<sup>5</sup> Reviewed in the CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VIII, p. 479.

<sup>6</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 7s. 6d. each volume.

volume is provided with an index. Here and there, of course, are statements that one might question. Thus, was it St. Celestine V whom Dante charged with the "great refusal," and not rather Pilate? Again, may we dismiss Tertullian's testimony that St. John was miraculously delivered from boiling oil at Rome as probably having no firmer basis than certain apocryphal although early "Acts of John"? Is not Kellner's *Heortology* a trifle hypercritical at times?

*Diversity in Holiness*, by the Rev. R. H. J. Steuart, S.J.,<sup>7</sup> is a collection of lives of saints and certain other holy persons, told in a pleasing and interesting way. The subjects treated are Mother Julian of Norwich, St. Francis de Sales, St. Bernadette, St. Teresa of Lisieux, St. Catherine of Genoa, St. Benedict Joseph Labre, St. John Vianney, St. Benedict, Marie Eustelle Harpain, The Holy Man of Tours, Brother Lawrence, St. Ignatius of Loyola, The Abbé Huvelin. The purpose of Fr. Steuart is to bring out the identity in diversity that is to be found in Christ's chosen followers and to show that holiness means complete self-fulfilment, its absence failure or incompleteness.

*Ignatius Loyola* adds one more to the many interesting studies of this great Saint. It is written by an American non-Catholic, the Rev. Robert Harvey, Minister of the Fort Garry United Church at Winnipeg.<sup>8</sup> The writer has many qualifications for his task, not least a full admiration for his subject. He has been in constant touch with Catholic sources; and his book is published in the Science and Culture series, the general editor of which is the Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J.

For those who wish to have a ready account of Theresa Neumann, with impressions of an eye-witness, *Theresa Neumann*<sup>9</sup> may be recommended. It is the joint work of Fr. Charles E. Roy, a Canadian, who had already written on her in French, and of Fr. W. Joyce, Parish Priest of St. Mary's, East Finchley. The writers fully believe in the supernatural character of Theresa's experiences. The evidence for their attitude is given very briefly in this book.

The second of the series of Lives for children which Messrs. Burns Oates and Washbourne are publishing has recently appeared. It treats very beautifully of St. John Bosco.<sup>10</sup> The children are sure to appreciate it.

The second volume of the English translation of Canon Trochu's *Insight of the Cure d'Ars*<sup>11</sup> continues the mass of anecdotes which illustrate his supernatural insight. It is more interesting than the first volume.

J. C.

<sup>7</sup> Sheed & Ward. pp. vii., 221. 6s.

<sup>8</sup> London: Coldwell. pp. xix., 273. 11s.

<sup>9</sup> London: Ouseley. pp. vii., 198. 3s. 6d.

<sup>10</sup> By Wilkinson Sherren. Boards, 1s.

<sup>11</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. pp. xv., 234. 10s. 6d.

## II. LITURGY.

BY THE VERY REV. CONSULTOR J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.S.

The appearance of two more fascicles of the indispensable *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* is a further reminder that the great work is now well on the way to completion. As always, it is stated to be produced "avec le concours de plusieurs collaborateurs," but the contributions to the present numbers are all signed by the editor himself, Dom Henri Leclercq. Not all the articles are of strictly liturgical interest, since, as might be expected, archæological questions occupy a great part of the dictionary. In the present fascicles (CXXXVIII-CXXXIX), which cover the subjects from "Oratio Cypriani" to "Orvieto," there is a clear treatment of the "Ordines Romani," occupying in all some forty columns. After a few "notions générales" and a brief study of the *Ordo Romanus vulgatus* edited by Melchior Hittorp in 1568, Dom Leclercq passes on to consider the editions of the *Ordines* from Mabillon to Duchesne, discusses the commentaries and classification, and devotes the greater part of his space to a systematic consideration of the fifteen *Ordines* classified by Mabillon. Of the *Ordo romanus I* he writes: "Les plus anciens témoins manuscrits ne sont pas antérieurs au ix<sup>e</sup> siècle, néanmoins le texte qu'ils nous ont conservé est antérieur d'un siècle au moins et on pourrait remonter plus haut vers l'époque où le texte a commencé à s'assembler et à prendre forme, ce qui pourrait nous conduire vers le temps de saint Grégoire et même plus tôt, au v<sup>e</sup> siècle" (col. 2417). As might be expected, a good deal of the study depends upon the Abbé Michel Andrieu's *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Age I. Les manuscrits*, published in 1931 and, unfortunately, not yet completed by the second volume, which is to give a critical text of the *Ordines*.<sup>2</sup>

The article on the "Organisation de l'église anténicéenne" (coll. 2582-2606), while it is mainly of dogmatic interest, has an interesting section on the origin of the parochial system. A fuller discussion of this matter is promised under the heading "Paroisse rurale." Meanwhile, the author concludes that "le régime paroissial n'exista pas dans les grandes villes, à Rome, à Alexandrie, avant le milieu du v<sup>e</sup> siècle. Au contraire, nous le rencontrons, en Orient, dès les premières années du iv<sup>e</sup>" (col. 2605).

The subject of "Orientales (liturgies)" is only briefly considered (coll. 2653-65). There is a summary treatment of the chief liturgical families, a section on the liturgical languages, and some notes on liturgical buildings. The bibliography is assuredly not exhaustive and contains no book published later than 1896. In this respect, Père S. Salaville's *Liturgies*

<sup>1</sup> Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1936. Price 20 francs each fascicle, postage extra.

<sup>2</sup> See the very full notice by His Lordship Bishop Myers in *CLERGY REVIEW*, Vol. II, pp. 537-39.

*orientales: notions générales, éléments principaux*<sup>3</sup> is a far more satisfactory guide, as it is also a fuller and more authoritative account of the liturgies of the Christian East.

The recently published work of Dr. Luigi Moretti, honorary Academician of the Pontifical Roman Liturgical Academy, has as its title *Caeremoniale juxta ritum Romanum seu de Sacris Functionibus, Episcopo celebrante, assistente, absente in partes septem digestum*.<sup>4</sup> It is to be completed in four volumes, of which the first deals with preliminaries, the second with the divine Office and the Mass, the third with sacred functions, whether ordinary or exceptional, and the fourth with the sacraments and sacramentals. Only the first of these, which is styled *De quibusdam notionibus sacram Liturgiam respicientibus*, has so far appeared, but the remaining volumes are said to be in the press, and the complete work is likely to be a compilation of remarkable value. In a preliminary notice, attached to the publisher's circular, Dr. Ronald Pilkington, an English priest domiciled in Italy, explains clearly the purpose and importance of the work. It has long been felt that the ceremonial laws of the Church, which at present are contained in a multitude of publications, ought to be codified after the manner of the Canon Law, and this desire found expression during the sitting of the Italian National Liturgical Congress, lately held at Genoa. The present manual has no official character, but, as Dr. Pilkington declares, it may well serve as a model when the time for codification comes. It will contain in four volumes of manageable size all the relevant rubrics of the liturgical books, the decrees of the Congregation of Rites, and the canons of the *Codex juris canonici*.

Up to the present, as Dr. Pilkington reminds us, the chief text-book of ceremonies has been Menghini's edition of Martinucci's *Manuale Sacrarum Caeremoniarum*, but "*hoc in Opere materiae ordinatio, nec non expositio desiderantur, quapropter legentibus res haud evidens statim existit, nec aptius perspicitur*. Cl. Moretti, e contrario, hoc perspicuum meritum habet, quod accessum ad sacrarum caeremoniarum scientiam omnibus Ecclesiasticis viris libere patefacit." All this is well said, and it is to be hoped that this useful and excellent work will have a very large sale. The first part, which is coincident with the first volume, has, as its beginning, a chapter on liturgical law, which discusses the nature of such law, the Church's liturgical books, the rubrics and their obligation, the Congregation of Rites and other congregations which control the liturgy, and the binding force of liturgical decrees. A second chapter is concerned with the topic: "*De Temporis Supputatione*," after which the author passes on to consider the character and rights of various ecclesiastical personages—Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, Vicars General, Canons, Protonotaries, and Domestic Prelates.

<sup>3</sup> Bloud & Gay, Paris, 1932. See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. VI, pp. 231-32.

<sup>4</sup> Marietti, Torino, 1936. Pp. xii.+257. Price 12 lire.



There follows a chapter (XVI) on ecclesiastical precedence, and then comes a series of chapters on the sacraments, the Divine Office, and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The remaining chapters have as their titles such subjects as *Missa Conventualis*, sacred music, churches, oratories, altars, cemeteries, the custody and cultus of the Holy Eucharist, and the *cultus Sanctorum*, *Sacrarum Imaginum et Reliquiarum*. It will be seen that this preliminary volume covers a great number of subjects, and it is to be hoped that the remaining parts will shortly put in an appearance.

In an earlier issue of these notes, reference was made to three works of major importance for liturgical study, namely, the text-books of Eisenhofer, Barin and Stapper.<sup>5</sup> All of these were large and relatively expensive books, making some attempt at completeness. A humbler but scarcely less important purpose is served by the third, revised, edition of a text-book by Dr. Francesco Stella, C.M., entitled *Institutiones liturgicae in seminariorum usum*.<sup>6</sup> The first volume deals with the liturgy in general, and with the sacraments and sacramentals. The second is concerned with the Divine Office and with Holy Mass. The price of the little books is exceedingly moderate, but, in spite of limitations of space, the authors have managed to convey a quantity of information and, in general, to give their authorities, among which the late Dr. Fortescue's book on the Mass frequently appears. The unattractive method of question and answer, which in the opinion of some readers at least is a less pleasing feature of Canon McMahon's admirable *Liturgical Catechism*, might perhaps be dispensed with in later editions.

In a recent article in *Thought* on "The Study of Eastern Liturgies"<sup>7</sup> I ventured to remark that: "One of the chief needs of the present day is a simplified and less expensive edition of Brightman." The reference was, of course, to the late Dr. F. E. Brightman's *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, of which only the first volume ("Eastern Liturgies") was ever published. Of this work it was rightly said, in the course of an obituary notice of its editor, that it provides "in a single volume packed with minute information and meticulous learning the necessary starting point for all students of the subject."<sup>8</sup> It gives within the compass of a single work the text of practically all the eastern liturgies in use at the present time, and nothing so serviceable has been produced before or since. There are, it is true, editions of individual rites, and volumes of selections, but these are evidently not of the same value for a student,

<sup>5</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XI, pp. 228-231.

<sup>6</sup> At the office of *Ephemerides liturgicae*, via Pompeo Magno, 21, Rome. Vol. I (1929), pp. xviii.+130. Price 6 lire. Vol. II (1935), pp. 300. Price 10 lire.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. XI, Number 1. June, 1936. Pp. 5-18.

<sup>8</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXIII, pp. 337-9.

though they are very welcome, in default of something more complete. Recently the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies has published three brochures which are concerned respectively with the Byzantine, the Chaldaean and the Syro-Maronite liturgies. They are entitled: *Modo facile di attendere alla Liturgia Bizantina detta di San Giovanni Crisostomo*,<sup>9</sup> *La Messa Caldea detta "degli Apostoli"*,<sup>10</sup> and *Modo facile di seguire la Messa Siro-Maronita*.<sup>11</sup> All are constructed on much the same plans, but, whereas the first booklet makes use of Dom Placid de Meester's translation, the second and third are versions made by the present editors. The introduction of divisions and headings by P. Raes, who is imitated in this matter by the other editors, should make the following of the liturgies relatively easy, though it must, of course, be noted that only Italian translations are provided and not the original texts. It is to be expected that this unambitious but practical little series will, in course of time, include translations of all the liturgies in use among eastern Catholics. In the case of the Syro-Maronite liturgy, it is stated by the editor that this is the first Italian translation to appear, though various versions in Latin, French and Arabic have gone to its making.

The Church's laws regarding funerals and funeral rites are noted for their complexity, and it was an excellent idea of that well-known liturgist. Mgr. C. Callewaert, late rector of the Bruges diocesan seminary, to write a short treatise *De Exsequiis Quaestiones Liturgicae*.<sup>12</sup> Here may be found an answer to such questions as the following: What is the history of the Church's attitude towards the use of a funeral car or hearse? What is the present-day legislation about the presence of confraternities in the funeral cortège and the carrying of banners and flags? What should be the order of the funeral procession? What is the reason for the distinction made between priests and other Christians as regards the position in which their bodies are laid before the altar? What are the rules regarding the coffin, the pall, insignia laid upon the coffin, and the use of flowers and wreaths? What are the various rubrics governing the *absolutio pro defunctis*? These and many other matters are carefully considered by Mgr. Callewaert, who, as readers of his other works will recognize, has the gift of writing concisely and of compressing much information into little space. It is interesting to note that, in the diocese of Bruges, in terms of a papal indult of August 9th, 1897, it is permissible to recite certain formulae at the graveside which are not contained in the *Rituale Romanum*. So, after the recitation of the *Benedictus* and its antiphon, the priest says, while he sprinkles the grave with holy water: "Hodie sit in pace locus tuus, et habitatio

<sup>9</sup> Edited by P. A. Raes, S.J. Pp. 46. Price 1 lira.

<sup>10</sup> Edited by Raffaele Rabban. Pp. 49. Price 1 lira.

<sup>11</sup> Edited by G. M. Cachin. pp. 51. Price 1.50 lire.

<sup>12</sup> Bruges, G. Barbiaux-Philips, 1935. Pp. 62. Price 1.60 belgas.

tua in Sancta Sion, Per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen." In the same diocese, and in many German dioceses, various formulae are employed when earth is cast upon the coffin, for example: "Memento homo quia pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris," or "Sume terra quod tuum est; terra es et in terram ibis."

Fr. F. Pinkman, of New Milton, whose *Place-Names of the Roman Breviary* has been of service to many of the clergy, has now produced a larger work entitled *Knots Untied of the Latin Psalter*,<sup>13</sup> of which he writes in his preface: "The object of the following study is to give a vocabulary of words and phrases which have a peculiar meaning, and to give a rendering, which the Latin can bear, of obscure or difficult passages." Both parts of the booklet are useful, and the author has evidently made a close study of the commentators in search of the best interpretations.

### III. HISTORY.

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, Lic.Sc.Hist.

The two latest fascicules (XI and XIII, i.e., pp. 641-800, 801-960 of Vol. II) of Dom Poulet's *Histoire du Christianisme* (published by Beauchesne, 117 Rue de Rennes, Paris) are, for the most part, well up to the high standard of their predecessors. Fr. Gorce, O.P., contributes the chapter that deals with the foundation of his own order—a useful resumé but poor by comparison with the really able section on the Franciscans, the work of Fr. Gratien, O.M. Cap., which follows it. The forty pages of this last section form the best short account we know of the early history of the order (St. Francis to the bull *Exiit qui seminat* of Nicholas III in 1279). The account of the heresies on account of which these great orders came into being, and against which and the evils that produced them they strove so mightily, is the work of Dom Poulet himself and satisfying in every respect. The least successful chapters—and they are the least successful of the whole great work so far as it has yet progressed—are in the same writer's exposition of the relations of the papacy and the French kings in the last years between St. Louis' death and the coming of Boniface VIII. Whenever Dom Poulet touches the question of Guelfs and Ghibellines some perverse influence takes hold of his very style—as witness his two-volume work on the subject<sup>1</sup>—and his usual lucid, simple language is interrupted continually by mock heroics, sarcasms, and threatening apostrophes to the villains of the story. Nor does he seem to see his way clearly through the tangle of events he must summarise. The treatment of the famous quarrel between the papacy and Philip the Fair of France is much better. It is studied as a crisis that affects the whole of Church history and it

<sup>13</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1936. Pp. 39. Price 2s. 6d.

<sup>1</sup> Guelfes et Gibelins. Brussels. 1922.

is good to see the space given, in a book for the general reader, to the theorists who, on both sides, carried on the war with their pens—not the least of such being Dante. In the second of these fascicules there is an unexpected, but very welcome section (pp 821-851) on the churches of the east, Catholic and Schismatic, from the pen of Fr. Janin editor of the *Echos d'Orient*.

But the greater part of the book is taken up with a description of Catholic life during what has been called the high period of the Middle Ages. It is all very well to know what pope excommunicated which emperor and why, to be able to distinguish Albigenses from Vaudois and Cluniacs from Cistercians. But what kind of life did the ordinary Catholic of these times lead? Did he keep the commandments as well as, or less well than, the Catholic of to-day? What did the sacraments mean to him? How far did he understand his religion? What kind of clergy served his needs in his parish church? How were they recruited and formed? How did they preach and what ideals inspired their lives? This is the real church history, the fortune of the gospel of Jesus Christ in the lives of the millions who profess belief in it. To those who want to see such questions answered I feel disposed to risk the exaggeration and say that it is not possible in a short space to better the account that is given here (pp. 851-960). It is the work of Dom Poulet and also of M. Le Bras, of the University of Paris and the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, who contributes a chapter (*La Justice d'Eglise*) on the Canon Law and the means through which it functioned in the thirteenth century, and also of M. Dumoutet, of the seminary of Issy, who writes on *La Liturgie Médiévale*. It remains to add that both fascicules are very well illustrated.

Mr. Watkin Williams' *St. Bernard of Clairvaux*<sup>2</sup> is a book that fills a long-standing want. Despite the fact that it is now forty years and more since the first appearance of Vacandard's standard life of the saint—to which Mr. Williams pays tribute very handsomely—nothing approaching that great book has hitherto been written in our own language. Here at last we have a full and readable account of the life of one who played an immense part in the social history of his times, not only as the real founder of his order—and the personal founder of no fewer than sixty-eight of its abbeys—but as the universal arbiter of Christendom, to whom princes, kings, bishops and the very popes themselves turned during thirty years as to the oracle of God. It is doubtful whether any of the saints ever, for so long a time, wielded such an influence as did this patriarch of the Cistercians. In Mr. Williams the saint has a sympathetic, or more truly an enthusiastic biographer, to whom the careful search for whatever trace this world still holds of St. Bernard's life and labours has been a labour of love and the work of a lifetime. The book is beautifully produced, well illustrated from sketches and photographs by members of the author's family. There are good

<sup>2</sup> Manchester University Press. 1935. pp. xxxviii, 423. 25s.

indexes, several maps and the sources for the author's statements are fully set out and yet do not hinder the progress of the reader. It is a book on which to congratulate the author.

St. Bernard figures in the calendar as doctor and he is traditionally known as the last of the fathers. He is also the principal source of the greater part of what it may be permitted to call popular piety—of all those forms of prayer and points of view in meditation which move the emotions to love of God and sorrow for sin. In this last respect his influence has gone beyond even Catholicism and can be traced without difficulty in the non-Catholic hymnology, too. It is not, however, this aspect of the saint that really occupies Mr. Williams. He recognizes, and indeed states explicitly, that “primarily St. Bernard was neither a philosopher, nor a theologian, nor a statesman, but a mystic. It was in and through prayer, the bed-rock of mysticism, that the call came to him first to the religious life, then to be a master . . . in its school and finally, by a pressure of circumstances which irked him . . . to fulfil the functions of a prophet to the Christendom of his day.” It is St. Bernard the prophet and reformer of Christendom who is Mr. Williams’ subject.

Of the story as he tells it we have only one criticism to make, namely, that his enthusiasm for St. Bernard seems to have obscured the fact that the Archbishop of York, whom St. Bernard fought so fiercely—largely on hearsay reports—and whom he called on the pope to treat as another pope had treated Ananias and Simon Magus, was, no less than St. Bernard, a saint himself. The story, one of difficulties, it is lawful to presume, for any biographer of St. Bernard, does less than justice to St. William of York, as Mr. Williams tells it. Nor is it merely to be “doubted whether he was quite the scoundrel which the Cistercians . . . made him out to be.” Nor is the following anything like an adequate account of “the other side” or of the *cultus* given to the archbishop: “In order to be quite fair to the archbishop, it should be said there were some who in spite of the charges attaching to his election could speak well of him. Such was the anonymous writer who, certainly no later than the thirteenth century, telling the story of his life, could imply that after the irregular fashion not uncommon in those days he had been raised by local veneration to the altars of the Church.”

Whatever touches, even remotely, the history of the century of the Reformation is bound to have an interest for Catholics, and constitutional history touches it very closely. Indeed without some knowledge of this traditionally arid matter, the significance of much that was done, and of the manner of its doing, must escape the student. “Parliament,” “council,” “proclamation,” the terms recur on every page even of the school text-books. But were these institutions the same kind of things that to-day bear their names? On such knowledge as Mr. Pickthorne’s two books<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Early Tudor Government. I, Henry VII. pp. 192. 108. 6d. II, Henry VIII. pp. 564. 255. Cambridge University Press.



set out a true interpretation of the past is bound to depend very largely. The method he adopts gives life to his subject and keeps the discussion actual. The reign is shown as a practical problem of administration and the constitutional development as the attempted solution of it. We no longer, thanks to Mr. Pickthorne's skill, examine a museum of specimens, tray after tray of neatly labelled minutiae, but are informed spectators of a very human drama.

How far should the question of the right and wrong in human conduct occupy the constitutional historian? This is far too complicated a matter to discuss here, but admitting that he is chiefly concerned to describe the due process by which what was done was done, it is somewhat disconcerting to find Mr. Pickthorne an instinctive Macchiavellian, his detachment often deserting him so that he positively crows over the defeat of spiritual values in the time of Henry VIII. It is very curious how in this age of emancipation and final enlightenment Catholicism can still stir up such emotions that the scientist's reason ceases, temporarily, to guide him. But so it is and, in more than one place, like a lesser and very much out of date Gibbon, Mr. Pickthorne, too, patronises in the footnotes matters which he evidently does not understand at all—in one place going out of his way altogether to make his little joke against the Blessed Sacrament. Cambridge, 1935<sup>4</sup>! Such things are unpleasant blemishes in a work otherwise very useful indeed and to be studied, critically, by all.

It would be entirely wrong if the canonisation of SS. John Fisher and Thomas More left the impression that all we need do to honour the English martyrs is now accomplished, or if that happy event obscured the history of those who preceded them in their ordeal and triumph—the glorious fathers and brothers of the Charterhouse. Nearly fifty years ago there was published the story of their passion written by one of their own brethren, Dom Maurice Chauncy, himself actually a member of the London Charterhouse and an eyewitness of the events he records. Dom Chauncy was one of the minority who, broken by imprisonment and misled by sophistries and false promises, finally took the oaths. After some years he escaped from England and made his way to the Charterhouse of Bruges, where he remained until the accession of Mary. He then returned to England and gathered together, in the restored Charterhouse of Sheen, what was left of his brethren after the twenty years of storm. With Elizabeth's coming this went the way of all the rest, and once more Dom Chauncy went into exile, to become the superior of that community of English Carthusians which, known always as *Sheen Anglorum*, was to survive in one place or another, for still two hundred years. During his exile Dom Chauncy composed four separate accounts of the glorious events amid which the ancient

<sup>4</sup> Anyone interested in this matter of the cultured materialist's irritation at the manifestations of the spiritual should read Fr. Brodrick's admirable article in *The Month* for August last, in which he examines Miss Waddell's book *The Fathers of the Desert* and Mr. Harold Nicholson's account of it.



English province of his order had come to an end. The one now for the first time printed<sup>5</sup> is the latest of them all, for it was written in 1570. It is a simple and moving story, spiritual reading of the best sort, where the edification comes of the very tale told. With the Latin text is printed an excellent translation. Miss Margaret Thompson, whose authority in what relates to English Carthusian history is well known, contributes a very welcome introduction and Bishop Frere, an old scholar of the Charterhouse School, a brief preface. The book is illustrated from sixteenth-century prints of the martyrdoms. The whole work, for which we cannot be too grateful, is the outcome of the piety of a group of one-time scholars of the Charterhouse School, whose generosity provided the means for the book's publication.

Was Mary Queen of Scots justly put to death? Had she been, in fact, a party to plots to murder Elizabeth? Was the evidence produced in the trials of the Babington conspiracy genuine? And was the Babington conspiracy itself a real conspiracy? Or was it not rather a device of the English Government—more particularly of the God-fearing, Puritan Secretary of State, Sir Francis Walsingham—intended to provide a means by which to put the Scottish queen out of the way with the minimum of odium to her assassins and the maximum of ignominy to herself and to the religion she professed? These questions have long stirred students of history to heated debate. To Mr. Alan Gordon Smith, for his new book, they must all henceforth be debtors, for he there reviews the whole complicated problem. He has all the extant documents before him and he sets out his case—a task which for its difficulty and interest outdistances the best of detective stories—with judicial fairness. The English Government desired to see Mary entrapped in a conspiracy against Elizabeth's life. They found, easily enough, discontented English Catholics ready to plot. Their spies and *agents provocateurs* fanned the talk of a group of such young Catholics until, in talk, they were ready for any fantasy. Then the "conspirators" were given a means to get in touch with Mary, in the hope that sooner or later the queen would commit herself to an explicit approval of a murder plot. In this she disappointed the Government but they did, thanks to the Babington conspiracy, come by letters that required the minimum of alteration to look like a proof of the queen's complicity. Then they struck. The motley handful of young idealists, foolish some and braggart, swaggerers, too, and yet victims already of a régime of terror and proscription, were arrested and tried in a setting arranged as a national deliverance from universal massacre. Then, the Babington trial having "proved" the Scottish queen's guilt, it was at last a matter of simplicity to "remove" Mary herself. Mr.

<sup>5</sup> *The Passion and Martyrdom of the Holy English Carthusian Fathers*. The Short Narration, by Dom Maurice Chauncy. The Latin text with English translation, by A. F. Radcliffe. Edited by G. W. S. Curtis. S.P.C.K. pp. 165. 8s. 6d.

Smith does not so much argue his point as present the evidence, and the evidence proves him right. The story, as he tells it, is fascinating reading.

It is very sad to have to record that in the short interval since the publication of Mr. T. P. Ellis's last book,<sup>6</sup> its gifted author has died. For the book strengthens the impression, made by his earlier book on the Welsh martyrs, as to the very real historical gifts and the competence in using them Mr. Ellis possessed. The death of so talented and so devoted a son of the Church in Wales is indeed a loss to us all. *Requiescat in Pace.*

The insularity of the English is a very singular thing. It can ignore whatever happens beyond the seas and it can assume that all that happens this side those same waters is somehow English. Hence the real educational value of the national movements within our own boundaries. Here in Mr. Ellis's book we have a startling reminder that the revival of Benedictine Monasticism among us was very largely the work of the Welsh. The Celtic fringe is, yet once again, shown to be anything but a fringe. It is the very heart and centre of a work destined to affect English life for centuries to come. The heroes of the book are principally the four monks, Blessed John Roberts, Dom Leander Jones, Dom Augustine Baker and Blessed Philip Powell. The time is the first half of the seventeenth century. The story of the way in which natives of these islands began once more to find their way into the monastic life is told again, simply, fully and in a spirit that compels sympathy and admiration. Once they had made their way into the monasteries of Spain and Italy the apostolic spirit gave these monks no rest until they had won from their superiors and from the Holy See permission to work as missionaries within the deadly English mission field. Then, with much labour, many anxieties—and an immensity of opposition from the newer spirituality that had been founded, as it were, on the grave of monasticism and now, more surprised than delighted, saw the supposed corpse once more stirring vigorously—the first English monastery of the restoration was founded at Douai, and the last of the monks of the Westminster Abbey community adopted the new monks as his brethren. Dom Leander Jones is one of the heroes of the tragic period when dissension tore English Catholicism as never before and he lives in that story as a peacemaker. In Fr. Baker we have the one classic doctor of the spiritual life to write in English—a great figure strangely neglected when an enterprising publisher, a year or two back, treated us to sketches of native sanctity in *The English Way*. The book is well printed, well indexed, with genealogical tables. It contains a wealth of information not otherwise easily accessible, and it makes most interesting reading, but, alas, there is scarcely a single reference note to indicate the sources whence it all came.

<sup>6</sup> *The Welsh Benedictines of The Terror*, by T. P. Ellis. Printed and published for the author by The Welsh Outlook Press, Newtown, Montgomery. pp. 218. 12s. 6d.

*The Register of John Swayne, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, 1418-1439*, with some entries of earlier and later archbishops, edited by D. A. Chart, I.S.O., Litt.D., Deputy-Keeper of the Records of Northern Ireland,<sup>7</sup> is the kind of book that must interest every student of history, for the bishop's register is the record of the principal acts of his administration—ordinations, appointments of officials, appointments to benefices, leases of ecclesiastical property, summonses to councils, transactions with the various royal officers. The papers in Archbishop Swayne's register, are, for the most part, of this humdrum character. Now and then matters of more general interest appear. There is, for example, an interesting list of the soldiers in the pay of the Lord Deputy Thomas Stanley, which shows a great number of Lancashire names; there are documents relating to the quarrel between Pope Eugene IV and the Council of Basle. There is a poem denouncing the extravagance of women's dress as a cause of sin that reads very quaintly.

The Archbishop was an Englishman, but the greater part of his diocese was a foreign land and he never seems to have got as far even as his cathedral city. Drogheda and Dundalk were his usual places of residence, and his dean and the chapter seem to have governed what part of his see lay "among the Irish." On the other hand, his suffragans were almost always Irishmen.

The most interesting thing, however, about Dr. Chart's edition of this register is the kind of mistakes that fill the translation. We are not given the text of the register, but only a translation and, apparently, for every occasion when the Latin scribe contracted a word the editor has devised a contraction in his English version. A list of the contractions used is, of course, given, but it is none the less disconcerting to find, and to find frequently, such entries as "other Mh. elgy. who make the cptr. in Mh. Ch." As for the quality of the translation—the mistakes are such as to suggest that medieval Latin is to Dr. Chart an unknown tongue. Certainly ability to handle Lewis and Short is not the only qualification needed by whoever would edit a medieval text. We hear (p. 2) of a grant of land and there is in it a reservation about "the native men"—where *nativi* = serfs. Again, and more than once, the pope acts "by the Council of his brothers" where what the text says is surely "by their advice." Page 10 notes an excommunication of those who cite prelates maliciously "or other Christ's faithful, or those of this kind procuring"—the last cryptic phrase being illustrated by a reference, in brackets, to the original *huiusmodi procurantes*. A commemoration of St. Patrick is ordered to be made once a week if there is a vacant feria—which the editor renders "if holy days be vacant." Again there is a reminder to the bishops that they consecrate the holy oils every Maundy Thursday, but Dr. Chart understands by it "each bishop . . . shall . . . on each Thursday at the Lord's Supper consecrate oil in the Church's

<sup>7</sup> His Majesty's Stationery Office, Belfast. 1935. pp. xvi., 235. 10s. 6d.

form." Nor does he recognize, when he meets it, the Latin for Easter Tuesday ("the morrow of Easter and the third holiday following," p. 12). Most strange of all is his ignorance of the Latin name of the day we all call Good Friday. "The Archbishop orders that the faithful abstain from servile work on the sixth holy day before Easter which is called the feast of the Preparation." Again, thoughtfully, he prints from his original *Paraskeve* in brackets after Preparation. When directions are given as to the manner in which the feast of St. Columbkil should be kept, Dr. Chart is quite stumped. He says "under feast and manner *novem Lect.* each year," and leaves it at that. So these amateur crudities go on to disfigure every page of this work of official scholarship that emanates from the new State whose capital is Belfast. To comment further would be tempting, but we forbear.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### MAY DEVOTIONS.

Would you be so good as to give a short account of the *Origin* of the Devotion of the Month of May. Did it originate in Rome with a few children's singing of the Litany of Mary and is the Litany specially connected with the May month? (SACERDOS.)

### REPLY.

The custom of devoting a special month to some particular devotion is a good example of a non-liturgical popular practice. The origin of most of these devotions is not earlier than the seventeenth century. I cannot discover any more explicit account of associating May with devotion to our Lady than that given in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, Vol. X, page 542. It originated, according to this account, in Rome at the Roman College, towards the end of the eighteenth century. Fr. Latomia, S.J., started the practice amongst the students to counteract the growing infidelity and immorality of the times. From the Roman College it spread to other Colleges of the Society and through them to the Church at large. According to Scannell's *Catholic Dictionary*, it was introduced into England by Dr. Gentili, the famous Italian Father of Charity. It is the oldest example of a whole month being devoted to a special devotion. The Indulgences granted to encourage the practice are given to those who honour Our Blessed Lady in some special way during the month: (1) 300 days on each occasion; (2) a plenary Indulgence on the usual conditions on any one of the first eight days of the month.<sup>1</sup> Other similar monthly devotions in honour of our Lady have not obtained the same widely spread popularity, e.g., August in honour of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, December in honour of the Immaculate Conception. Very likely the similarity between the names "May" and "Mary" may, perhaps, be to some extent responsible. The Litany of Loreto is of more ancient origin and is not, we believe, specially connected with the origin of May Devotions. This litany, which probably dates from the middle of the fifteenth century, appears to have been first printed in a history of the Santa Casa of Loreto in 1576.

E. J. M.

### REFUSAL OF ABSOLUTION.

Is it strictly necessary for a penitent who has been denied absolution by one priest to mention this fact when seeking absolution from a second priest? (L.)

<sup>1</sup> Gougnard, *De Indulgentiis*, p. 284.

## REPLY.

There is no *strict* obligation to do so, since the refusal of absolution is clearly no sin and a penitent is strictly bound to confess only his mortal sins in their number and species. In the case where absolution has been refused by a confessor who has either misunderstood the penitent's condition, or has wrongly denied absolution owing to his own ignorance of moral theology, the matter can be left as we have decided—there is no obligation to mention the refusal. But, apart from such a case, which must be rare, it is evident that, as a general rule, the penitent is to be *advised and urged* to mention the previous refusal. He is confessing his sins in order to be absolved from them, and absolution was refused by the first priest because he had formed the judgment that the penitent was indisposed for absolution. No person is a judge in his own cause and, unless it is certain that the previous refusal was due to the confessor's ignorance or folly, the penitent is running the grave risk of obtaining an invalid absolution owing to the improper dispositions still remaining. It is, therefore, a matter of ordinary prudence for him to avoid this risk by mentioning the previous refusal. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that he is bound to do so, provided he keeps nothing from the second confessor which he is under a strict obligation to confess.

E. J. M.

## SHORTENED TENEBRAE.

Is it permitted in small churches to have a shortened Tenebrae consisting, say, of one nocturn, when circumstances make it quite impossible to have the rite in full? (E. A.)

## REPLY.

The *Memoriale Rituum* makes no mention of such a concession for small churches, and it is quite certain that an abbreviated Office could not be called *Tenebrae* without some qualification. On the other hand, the principle of a shortened office exists in the case of Matins and Lauds for the dead, one nocturn being permitted. We are of the opinion that the practice should not be introduced without authorization from the Ordinary, an authorization which would, no doubt, readily be given in cases where the full Office is judged to be impossible. In these days, when public appreciation of the liturgy is on the increase, it is most desirable to have some public Office on the last evenings of Holy Week, and especially on the evening of Good Friday. We can find no author who discusses this question but, perhaps, some of our readers who are interested in the liturgy may be able to quote some liturgical writer. There are various possibilities of abridgment, e.g., one nocturn followed by the Benedictus and the rest, and it would appear that any alteration of the rite would lead to abuse unless it is regulated officially.

E. J. M.



## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE VERY REV. MGR. J. MOSS, D.D.

### REGULATIONS WITH REGARD TO CERTAIN RITES IN MANCIUKUO.

One of the great obstacles to the Propagation of the Faith in the Far East lies in the impression very largely diffused in those parts that those who become Christians denationalize themselves: an Indian, Chinese or Japanese cannot embrace the Catholic Faith without denying his duties towards his country, without cutting himself off in some way from the ties that bind him to his own people and to his own civilization. Such is the impression. Added to this there are certain political aspects of a western expansion in the east, and this has especially alienated the cultured and governing classes from Christianity.

Along with this there must be considered a definite evolution in the matter of certain civil rites and ceremonies, formerly connected with grave superstitions and religious aspects which made them unacceptable to Catholics. These superstitions and religious aspects have, in many cases, disappeared, so that these rites and ceremonies, particularly the homage paid to Confucius, have now come to be, in many instances, nothing more than civil rites, unconnected with religion, and to have only a patriotic character. There have been official declarations to that effect.

Christianity is becoming more and more known in the east, and many of those already Christians have been much troubled in conscience as to whether they may assist at, or take part in, certain festivals and customs ordered by the civil authorities. The Ordinaries in these parts were anxious for guidance in these all-important matters. Their zeal met with great obstacles, their own faithful were subject to many anxieties and difficulties, and so the Church, jealously guarding the faith of Christ and yet willing to accommodate wherever there was no danger to the faith in the customs and practices of peoples, studied the whole question and, through the Vicars Apostolic of Kirin, in Manciuokuo, has given a reply to several questions on these matters. Without going back to the times of the judaizing Christians of the first century, it is interesting here to recall the advice given by St. Gregory to our own Apostle, St. Augustine—to destroy, not the temples of the pagans, but the idols; and to replace these by the Cross. Here are the questions, with their respective answers:

- I. The image of Confucius exposed in the schools—the honours that are paid to it.
- A. *The Schools of the Missions.*
  - Q.1. If the lawful authorities of the country give the order, may the exposition of the image of Confucius be tolerated in the Schools of the Missions?
  - R. Yes.

Q.2. May this image be placed in a kind of niche, more or less ornate, resembling that in which the pagans honour tablets of their ancestors?

R. It may be tolerated if there is a formal order and one that cannot be avoided. In the one case, as in the other, it must be clearly made known to the pupils that it is a question of a purely civil cult.

Q.3. May the pupils be permitted, if the civil authority imposes it, to make a more or less profound inclination before the image of Confucius thus exposed?

R. *Tolerari potest.*

Q.4. If in a Catholic School there is given an order to instal before the image of Confucius a kind of altar with candelabra, incense, etc., may this manner of action be tolerated?

R. No; because in spite of the reply of the authorities on the civil character of the cult paid to Confucius, the ceremony would present too great a likeness to the religious and superstitious practices and would cause scandal.

#### B. *Pagan Schools.*

Q.1. What attitude must be adopted by Christian pupils who frequent pagan schools and are constrained to take part in the honours paid to Confucius?

R. It will be suggested privately to them to take up a passive attitude, tolerating, as in the case above, the inclination.

Q.2. If, in a pagan village, the schoolmaster, not being able to obtain an image of Confucius, writes his name on a tablet, may one render the same honours as to his image?

R. *Tolerari potest.*

#### II. *Scholars, Military, Functionaries conducted in a body to the Pagodas.*

Q.1. What of a Christian in the service of authorities charged with duties of sacrifice, and fulfilling at the same time subalternate functions which he cannot refuse to fulfil without grave loss—e.g., loss of his position?

R. Proximate co-operation, but purely material, in a case of grave necessity—*tolerari potest.*

Q.2. What of a Christian pupil invited to sing, either solo or with others, during the sacrifice?

R. If it is a question of chants connected with the sacrifice—non licet. If it is a question of patriotic chants or hymns in honour of Confucius without any religious character—*tolerari potest.*

Q.3. If at the end of the sacrifice an inclination is imposed while the victims are still exposed, what is the duty of a Christian?

R. One may consider this last part of the ceremony as a civil cult, and therefore passive assistance can be "tolerated."

Q.4. What of partaking of the victim?

R. Nullo modo tolerari potest.

### III. *Monetary Co-operation in the Construction or Repair of the Pagodas.*

Q.1. May one co-operate financially in the construction or repair of the temples or any other edifice in honour of Confucius?

R. Tolerari potest.

Q.2. May one act in the same way if it is a question of temples for any other cult?

R. Distinguish: If it is a question of a tax comprised "in globo" with other exactions, then "tolerari potest."

If it is a question of a special tax made to cover the expenses of construction or repair, then "tolerari nequit."

Taxes made for the purpose of plays are subject to the same distinction. If it is a question of a play that is superstitious and organized, e.g., in consequence of a vow, Christians may not take part in it.

If it is a play under the title of popular rejoicing, the payment of the tax may be tolerated.

### IV. *Assistance at Pagan Funerals.*

Although this question does not form part of the matters connected with the cult of Confucius, yet it is of very actual interest and deserves to be studied.

1. Private funerals—the salute (inclination) before the dead, formerly rigorously forbidden to the Christians, seems to lose more and more its religious character. The evolution of customs, the present-day mentality which tends to see in this inclination a civil homage after the example of that made in the west, in fine, several precedents, seem to authorize us in tolerating for the future this salutation.

2. If it is a question of a purely passive assistance, tolerari potest. This toleration extends to the inclination and other external acts of homage which "in re mixta" are connected with the purely civil part of the ceremony.

The letter concludes: "In this question, as in all others, the Ordinaries of Manciuquo renew their entire and most respectful submission to the directions of the Holy See."

The Holy See by letter of the Congregation of Propaganda, dated, May 28th, 1935, has confirmed the above. The letter stated :

" In the audience of the 16th of the current month, His Holiness, having taken cognizance of what your Excellency has expounded and of the 'rotum' of H.E. Mgr. Costantini has expressed his mind :

" 1. That the Ordinaries of Manciukuo, in order to avoid any possible cause for scandal, must make known, with the necessary prudence suggested by the circumstances, the letter by which the Director of Worship of Manciukuo recently assured Your Excellency that the ceremonies in honour of Confucius 'have absolutely no religious character.'

" 2. That the same Ordinaries must be guided, in giving their rules to the faithful, by this official declaration.

" 3. That the priests, after having taken the prescribed oath *re* Chinese rites, must await the instructions of the Ordinaries, avoiding all questionings and controversies.

" This Congregation, for its part, holds that the Ordinaries in giving their rules to the faithful may conform themselves to the decisions taken by them in common in their reunion at Hsin-King. They seem to have been prudent and well-weighed. . . ."

Signed :

PETER CARD. FUMASONI-BIONDI, Prefect.

✱CARLO SALOTTI, ARCHBP. OF PHILIPPOLIS, Secretary.  
(*Oss. Romano*, July 2nd, 1936.)

INSTRUCTION TO H.E. MGR. PAOLO MARELLO, APOSTOLIC DELEGATE IN JAPAN, ON THE DUTIES OF CATHOLICS TOWARDS THEIR FATHERLAND.

A document similar in character has been sent by the Congregation of Propaganda to the Apostolic Delegate in Japan. In introducing the practical norm of action in certain ceremonies in Japan, the document calls attention to the fact that many times and urgently the Congregation has been asked to give a ruling as to how Catholics in Japan must regulate themselves in all cases where the law or national customs command or counsel the fulfilment of certain acts which seem to be derived from religious rites that are not Christian. It asserts that the Faith does not reject the rites and customs of any nation if they are in no way reprehensible; in fact it desires to defend and protect them. It quotes the question which the Archbishop of Tokio put to the Minister of Public Instruction asking : " Must we hold for certain that the reasons demanding the assistance of the students at certain acts are political and not religious?" The matter referred to was the visiting of the National Temples or Jinja. The answer was that the purpose of the visits was nothing more than to express sentiments of patriotism and loyalty. Other clear indications show very definitely that many of the rites and

customs had ceased to have any religious significance. The absence of Catholics at many of these customs laid them open to the charge of want of loyalty to and love for the homeland. Taking all these matters into consideration, the Congregation of Propaganda, after having studied the matter deeply and heard the views of people such as past Delegates Apostolic and the Ordinaries of Japan, in a plenary session of the Congregation laid down the following practical rules :

1. The Ordinaries of the territory of the Empire of Japan should instruct the faithful that to the ceremonies usually made in the Jinja administrated civilly by the Government, the Civil Authorities (as is shown by repeated and explicit declarations) as well as the common opinion of persons of a certain culture attribute only a significance of love of country, *i.e.*, of filial reverence towards the Imperial Family and the benefactors of the Fatherland. Hence, they must instruct the faithful that since these ceremonies have only a purely civil value, it is lawful for Catholics to take part in them and comport themselves like the other citizens, clearly explaining, however, their own intentions whenever that may seem necessary to avoid false interpretations of their own act.

2. The same Ordinaries may permit the faithful, when they take part in funerals, marriages and other private rites in use in the social life of Japan, to participate like other people (declaring, if necessary, their own intention as above) in all those ceremonies which, although perhaps of religious origin, yet on account of the circumstances of places or persons and according to the common opinion of to-day show nothing more than a significance of urbanity and of mutual affection.

3. With regard to the oath on the rites, wherever this is customary in Japan, the priests must with docility put into practice what is laid down in this matter in the present Instructions of the S. Cong. of Propaganda, abstaining from all controversy whatsoever.

The Holy Father having heard the report of all this in audience of the 25th of May given to the Secretary of the Congregation, has deigned to ratify the rules above indicated, declaring that the Ordinaries of Japan with security can and must follow them.

Rome. From the Palace of the S. Cong. of Propaganda, May 26th, 1936.

Signed :

PETER CARD. FUMASONI-BIONDI, Prefect.

✠CELSO COSTANTINI, ARCHBP. OF THEODOSIOPOLIS, Secretary.

(*Oss. Romano*, July 2nd, 1936.)

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Glorious Bondage of Illness: A Translation of Servitude et Grandeur de la Maladie*, by A.T. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 6s.)

Some part of the French original of this book appeared first in the review *Revue* from the pen of Madame France Pastorelli. That contribution was subsequently enlarged and the whole is now very successfully translated by A.T. The very title of the book with a rare felicity at once puts us in possession of Madame Pastorelli's theme. She has felt the bondage: "I at last understood, what every fibre of my being rebelled against, namely, that the malady which had seized me would not lose its hold, any more than a vulture would relinquish the prey gripped in beak and claw." She who had led a full artistic and family life, who was a gifted musician, a devoted wife and mother, found herself, without hope of release, confined to bed with a disease of the heart which allowed of no bodily activity and left her dependent on those whom it had been her delight to cherish and serve.

So much for the stark "bondage," but in it she discovers the "glory." She can continue to serve her fellows; activity damned in one direction bursts its confines and finds new and unexpected possibility of expansion in another. The divine gift of artistry, the demand for self-expression, is strong within her, and moreover she recognizes that while she has life at all she must live it to the fulness of her capacity. She will have none of the cowardice which is content to lie moaning beneath the burden; for her it is not enough to be ministered unto, she will minister; deprived of her natural instrument of expression, she will forge another. After her music she finds mere words clumsy tools, but she has certainly adapted herself to their use, for despite her modest disclaimer this book contains some very fine writing.

The work is divided into two parts. First, "The Drama of the Inner Self" discusses poignantly—some will think, ruthlessly—the bondage which is sickness. But having faced this horror she rises above it and shows how from it can be drawn an even greater fulness of life. For the meaning of life is to be found in spiritual—not necessarily supernatural—growth, and illness is no bar to that development. Not every sick person will be able to learn the lesson, but few who read these pages, whether in sickness or in health, will fail to be invigorated by the author's supreme and inspiring courage; and although without enduring some similar experience it will be difficult to learn the lesson thoroughly, still the healthy who give their minds to this argu-



ment will be building a bulwark for themselves against the trials which must normally come to us all.

The second part of the book, "The Drama of the Environment," is a more practical discussion of the relations between the hale and the sick. Those who minister to the sick—doctors, nurses, visiting friends—are warned to be not merely sympathetic, forbearing, tactful, but to avoid condescension and insincerity. The sick, for their part, have to learn to be less exacting, less petulant, less absorbing; to remember that others have their life to live, and so to practise thoughtfulness for them; above all, they must endeavour to give the best that is in them, realizing that they have still the power to give something very good.

This is a book not to be missed, least of all by those who have the continual duty of teaching the sick how to profit by their sickness.

T. E. F.

*Lord Palmerston.* By H. C. F. Bell. (Longmans. Two Volumes. 42s. net.)

This is a very long, very learned, very painstaking work by an American professor, and as such its appeal will be limited. It does not come in the class of popular biography so common nowadays; but for those who wish to make a close study of nineteenth century England, and for those who wish to know what Palmerston thought of the happenings of his time, recourse to this book will be essential. It is difficult, in fact, to know in what class to place this work. It is certainly not a "life and times" of Palmerston, nor is it a biography, for there is very little attempt to establish its hero's true worth. It is a careful collection, set out with sympathy and distinction of style, of Palmerston's opinions, which will go very far to explain why he acted as he did in the numerous matters which came before him. We could wish, now that Lord "Pumicestone's" methods have found imitators abroad, that some judgment were passed on them, and that Mr. Bell had told us to what extent he considers that they gave England the moral pre-eminence for which Palmerston strove—or said he strove. Within its self-imposed limitations this is a very fine piece of work.

Palmerston is the typical English statesman of the nineteenth century—a most laborious statesman, yet a man of the world equally at home in the House of Commons, in Society, and on the turf. At seventy-six he could ride to Harrow in the pouring rain, be tumultuously received by the boys, and then spend most of the night in the House of Commons. Palmerston saw that he must court public opinion, and that public opinion was the opinion of the thoroughly illogical and inconsistent "fat man in the white hat at the back of the twopenny omnibus." Throughout his long innings he always had one eye looking for the nodding approval of the white hat. He was the exponent of a nationalism through which he hoped to raise England's moral prestige, and a statesman whose motto was *ad majorem*

*Britanniae gloriam*, was likely to please a nation whose attitude towards foreigners was typified by the Victorian Mr. Punch. The Don Pacifico incident might be a scandalous piece of bullying, the Poles and the Magyars might be left in the lurch, the Queen might feel herself insulted, Metternich might murmur

Hat der Teufel einen Sohn,  
So ist er sicher Palmerston,

still the fat man in the white hat smiled with approval on the man he had nicknamed Cupid, for those unwashed foreigners were being made to jump.

Nowhere is his nationalism clearer than in his dealings with Catholic affairs. He supported emancipation, he favoured diplomatic relations with the Holy See, but he joined loudly in the uproar over the restoration of the hierarchy. The Pope, he said, "might as well claim jurisdiction over the waves of the channel, or the winds that raised them. . . . A cardinal has no place in England and as long as he is here there will be no peace or charity between Protestant and Catholic."

Palmerston's policy was a luxury nineteenth century England might be able to afford, but it cost a great price. Perhaps the best estimate of it was given by the foreign ruler, quoted in Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, who remarked on Pam's dismissal in 1852: "This is a blow to me, for as long as Lord Palmerston remained at the Foreign Office, it was certain that you could not procure a single ally in Europe."

R. BUTCHER.

*Carteret, The Brilliant Failure of the Eighteenth Century.* By W. Baring Pemberton. (Longmans. 12s. 6d.)

Of John, Lord Carteret, later first Earl of Granville, Egmont noted in his diary: "I find him a man of more universal reading than I had imagined which, joined with a happy memory, a great skill in Greek and Latin and fine elocution, makes him shine beyond any nobleman or gentleman now living."

That Carteret was the best educated and most cultured of all the eighteenth century ministers, there can be no serious doubt. At Oxford he had read while his contemporaries hunted, in Ireland he had silenced the redoubtable Swift with a singularly apt Latin quotation, and when back in London he could console himself for lack of office by sitting up half the night discussing the niceties of Homeric Syntax with Dr. Bentley. Carteret alone was master of the principal European languages, and could speak to his master in German at a time when Walpole and the other Whigs had to conduct their conversations with the sovereign in dog-Latin. Carteret was a man of genius, but at the time England demanded a man who would allow her to use her own talents. She found him in Sir Robert Walpole, who would work with no one who was not a mediocrity. So it was Carteret's fate to be one of the first to leave what Mr.

Baring Pemberton aptly calls the "*Ministry of the Eliminated Talents*."

When Carteret did come to power he was too old to adapt himself to the new politics created by Walpole and the Pelhams. His ideas of parliament as of foreign policy were in the Whig tradition of William III and Marlborough. He failed to appreciate that parliament had to be managed and that this was impossible without the aid of Newcastle and his brother. As a Whig of the very purest breed he ignored public opinion and despised parliamentary opposition—a policy all the more dangerous because of his departure from recent tradition in his conduct of foreign affairs. France he saw, and the author argues convincingly that he rightly saw, was the greatest danger to a balance of power in Europe, and so he set himself to build up a ring of mutually loyal German States, who would keep France to the left of the Rhine and eventually deprive her of Alsace. In negotiating these alliances Carteret was at home for he loved the palaces of Europe, and the difficulty of reconciling Maria Theresa with Frederick the Great only gave him further zest for the task. Yet it led to nothing, and very few can tell exactly what England or anyone else gained from George II's victory at Dettingen. Walpole's policy was insular, Carteret's was continental, the day for both had gone, and success was to come to Pitt whose policy was colonial.

Mr. Baring Pemberton is a very welcome recruit to the biographers of the eighteenth century. His work combines solid research with mature judgment and a style which is always attractive. It is much to be hoped that he will write another biography.

R. BUTCHER.

## REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

The August number of the HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW opens with an article by Dr. Charles Bruehl on *Human Values in Industry*, pleading for the restoration of the Christian conception of the unity of life "which will result in the redemption, moralization and humanization of industry." Mgr. Henry, writing on *Brotherly Love and Patriotism*, analyses the meaning of patriotism and declares that the virtue of love of country is to be supernaturalized according to the Gospel standard. A false interpretation of patriotism is to be ascribed, at least in part, to a misunderstanding of the parable of the Good Samaritan. In *Towards Paganism*, Dom E. Schmiedeler, O.S.B., discusses the danger of individualism in religion, politics and economics. Dr. John Steinmueller begins a series on *English Catholic Versions of the Bible*, with an account of the original Douay-Rheims Version, the revisions effected by Challoner and others, and the various modern editions. In a continuation of his studies in the *Penal Law of the Code*, Fr. Woywod, O.F.M., writes about censures of Papal and particular law, and deals

with the remission of censures by absolution and the differences between absolution in the internal and the external forum. *Is the Catholic a Mental Slave?* by Fr. T. Beehan, is an article which is sufficiently described by its title. *The Modern Pupil Progresses*, by Dr. Paul Campbell, strives to determine the value of the traditional examination system at the present day. Dom Ernest Graf in his *Survey of the Reviews* writes on such topics as predestination, confirmation by a simple priest, and the causes of slavery in Ethiopia.

The CATHOLIC WORLD for August has, as its principal article, one by Dr. Theodore Maynard on *G.K.C.* As might be expected, there is much that is fresh and attractive in Dr. Maynard's treatment, which has things to say about Mr. Chesterton's style, his method of composition, his unworldly outlook and his profound humility. Apropos of the last point, the author expresses the hope that somebody like Mr. Maurice Baring will undertake the official life, since the autobiography which is now in the press "is likely to be mainly an account of his ideas and controversies; he was altogether too humble a man to tell us much about himself." *Catholic Literature: Pages from a Primer*, by Mr. J. G. Morris, is a study in tendencies which dwells at some length upon the lives of John L. Stoddard, the author of "Rebuilding a Lost Faith," and Count Albert Appony. Mr. Bryan O'Reilly gives a moving, though somewhat out-of-date account of a pilgrimage to Lough Derg (it is no longer correct to speak of the "little" Chapel of St. Patrick, and there are more than two intervals during the night-vigil). *Something New in Universities*, by Mr. John Brown, author of "I was a Tramp" and "I Saw for Myself," is a study of education in Soviet Russia. *Tabb and Wordsworth* is an account by Mr. Emile Kessler of the influence of Wordsworth's poetry on the style of Fr. John Banister Tabb. *Enjoying England's Inconveniences*, by Miss M. S. Leitch, gives some excellent and amusing advice to Americans visiting England. Among other things, she notes that our tea is better than any obtainable in the States, that the differences of idiom and the perversities of the weather are things to be reckoned with when visiting the British Isles, and that it is not wise to "touch on any serious subject with the customary American lightness."

The issue of *LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE* for July 10th devotes a good deal of space to the Oxford groups. M. Claude Vignon has an article which aims at exposition, description and documentation, leaving criticism to a later writer. Among the documents is the translation of an article by a well-known Protestant professor, Dr. Emil Brunner, of Zürich, in which the author explains his reasons for participating in the movement. Finally, Père M.-J. Congar, O.P., gives us the point of view of a theologian who is concerned not to pass a definitive judgment, but to provide the elements for a sound diagnosis, indicating vulnerable points and insisting upon various features which must be added if the Groups are to become legitimate for Catholics. The

short bibliography of works in French on the Groups is a proof that the movement has excited great interest on the other side of the Channel. M. Maurice de Gandillac, in the section on social and political questions, writes on the progress of ideas from Hobbes's *Leviathan* to the totalitarian state. In a later number of the same review (July 25th-August 25th), Dr. Kurt Türmer discusses the future of Catholic youth in Germany of to-day, and points to the hollowness and insincerity of the Nazi plea that politics and religion should be wholly distinct and that the clergy should occupy themselves exclusively with the affairs of the next world. In the section on *Russie et Chrétienté*, Mademoiselle Danzas explains the position of the Catholic element in Czarist Russia, what was its origin and what will be its destiny. It is impossible, she declares, to give any exact figure regarding the number of Catholics in Russia at the present time. A dozen years ago the archdiocese of Mohilev had 171 parishes, the diocese of Kamenetz 100, and the diocese of Tiraspol 123. But persecution, and the death or imprisonment of so many of the clergy, have reduced these figures, so that many of the parishes exist only in name. The hour of the Catholic revival in Russia is still far off.

In the July-August issue of the NOUVELLE REVUE THEOLOGIQUE, Père E. Schiltz, C.I.C.M., has a valuable article on the Christology of St. Augustine, which stresses the philosophical conceptions underlying the Saint's doctrine and the great merit of St. Augustine's Christological teaching "d'avoir pu conserver à la nature humaine du Christ sa complète intégrité." The valuable series entitled *Où en est l'enseignement religieux?* has now been completed; the present number contains various "compléments," which include a bibliography of books, mostly in French, on religious instruction, education to purity, vocation, Catholic Action, and missionary activity.

The attractive NOTES DE PASTORALE JOCISTE prints two articles of importance—one on the *Jeunesse Catholique Ouvrière* and the recent strike; the other on the menace of Communism.

In the July-August number of DIVUS THOMAS (Piacenza), Père A. Raineri, O.P., begins a series *De possibilitate videndi Deum per essentiam*, in answer to Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., and P. G. M. Perrella, C.M., discusses the text *Et cognoverunt Eum in fractione panis*, deciding against the eucharistic interpretation.

The COLLATIONES NAMURCENSES for July has short articles on the gifts of fortitude and holy fear, on the maxim "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus," and on private cemeteries.

VERBUM DOMINI for July prints an article by P. U Holzmeister, S.J., on the Magdalen question, a commentary by P. Fl. Ogara, S.J., on Rom. viii. 16, a study by P. Theophilus ab Ortiso, O.M.C., of temptations as they are dealt with in the epistle of St. James, and an account of Syria in Holy Scripture by P. E. Vogt, S.J.

EPHEMERIDES LITURGICAE in the May-June number has a fine article on the person and office of our Lord as they are described in the liturgy, by Dom P. Oppenheim, O.S.B., professor of Liturgy at Sant' Anselmo.

#### FROM THE AUGUST HOME REVIEWS.

The DUBLIN REVIEW (July): Palestine Ablaze by Douglas V. Duff. Experiences and Reflections by Don Luigi Sturzo. At the Grande Chartreuse by Algar Thorold. Pio Nono by Rev. Humphrey Johnson. Holy Scripture and the Liturgy by Rev. Cuthbert Lattey. Dom Benedict Weld-Blundell by Dom Basil Whelan.

The MONTH: Ascetics and Humanists by James Brodrick. Ecclesia Maritima by C. C. Martindale. G. K. Chesterton by Gregory McDonald. Miss Sackville-West's "Saint Joan" by Herbert Thurston.

The IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD: The Church in China by Rev. John Blowick. The Economic World-Crisis by Rev. Peter Coffey. The Constitution of Matter by Rev. H. V. Gill. Anglo-Norman Dublin and Diocese by Rev. Myles V. Ronan.

BLACKFRIARS: Ebur Castitatis by Humbert Clérissac, O.P. Gilbert Keith Chesterton by Vincent McNabb, O.P. G.K.C.—The Writer by Peter Belloc. G.K.C.—The Distributist by Hilary Pepler. Is a Catholic Psychology Possible? by Aidan Elrlington, O.P.

PAX: St. Robert of Knaresborough by Abbot Cummins. Cluniac Origins by Watkin Williams. Why this Ignorance? by Jean Guittou. Memories of G.K.C. by Dom Raphael Davies.

J. M. T. B.

## THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

### CENTRAL EUROPE.

By C. F. MELVILLE.

#### *Repercussions of the Spanish Situation on Catholic Interests in Austria.*

The tragedy of the persecution of the Catholic Church by the Reds in Spain at present overshadows happenings in the Catholic world in other countries of Europe.

Nevertheless, the Spanish tragedy underlines a certain general tendency, noticeable throughout Europe, and that is the divisions of political and social allegiances into the two main categories of Right and Left. Between the extremes of these two main categories there are many shades, nuances and degrees. The Church does not support any political movement as such, whether of the Right or of the Left, but is concerned to maintain the Christian principles and practices for which she stands.



Communism; however, in principle and practice is the avowed enemy of the Church, and if there are any doubts on this score the present events in Spain supply the answer.

Thus the following situation, confusing in its detail, but clear enough in its main lines, emerges:—

The Spanish Civil War is causing, in the political and sociological spheres, two alignments in Europe. Countries with Left-wing sympathies sympathize with the so-called Spanish Government. Countries with Right-wing or Fascist sympathies sympathize with the so-called Spanish Rebels. Amongst the latter is Nazi Germany. Yet Nazi Germany continues to make war on the Catholic Church within the Reich, albeit not with the savagery of the Spanish Reds.

In Central Europe the Catholic elements can but look with horror upon the devilish Red attacks on the Church in Spain, and therefore such Catholic countries as Austria must necessarily be counted in that alignment of Powers whose detestation of Communism has ranged them ideologically on the side of the Spanish insurgents.

At the same time, one should be careful not to be misled by attempts in certain quarters to take cover behind this natural ideological alignment in order to urge the necessity for a Catholic acceptance of Nazism in Austria as the only possible barrier against Communism and anti-Catholicism in the Danube.

I refer to this aspect of things because recently, in the secular Austrian Catholic organ, the *Reichspost*, certain articles have appeared, anonymous, but attributed to Church dignitaries, which, if taken without reference to other and authoritative Catholic comment in Austria, might convey an inaccurate impression.

One such article, recently, stated that the Austro-German *rapprochement* was necessary because the identification of the Church in Austria with the fight against National-Socialism was causing thousands of Austrian Catholics to forsake the Church and become Protestant, and something had to be done to check this victory for Protestantism.

The same paper has also called for a Catholic line-up with the Nazis in a united front against Communism.

Here it is necessary to point out that the ideas of the Editor of the *Reichspost*, Dr. Funder, are not shared *in toto* by either the Austrian Heirarchy or all the chiefs of the Christian-Social Party. Many have, indeed, expressed indignation at these views.

The Catholic elements supporting the present Austrian régime remain both anti-Communist (and anti-Socialist) and anti-Nazi at the same time. They believe that for Austria the best barrier against Communism is the Austrian Christian Corporative State. Nazism, they know, contains, in its more extreme wing, ideas and practices inimical to Catholicism and to the ideal of the Christian State.

Catholic Austria, therefore, while naturally in the European alignment of the Right against the Left, as far as the Spanish situation is concerned, and as firm as ever in its fight against Communism at home, is not thereby to be regarded as necessarily obliged to accept a common front with Nazism *per se*.

The Government of Herr von Schuschnigg is loyal to the *rapprochement* made with Germany, although the local Nazis have not reciprocated that loyalty. But the determination to maintain Austria's independence, and to preserve the Austrian Christian Constitution against anti-Christianism is as strong as ever at the Ballhausplatz, whether the anti-Christian forces are coloured Red or Brown.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### AN EASTERN DAY AT ST. EDMUND'S.

Dr. Barton has received a letter from His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant, the recently appointed Secretary of the Sacred Congregation *pro Ecclesia Orientali*, congratulating him on the Eastern Day recently organized at St. Edmund's College. His Eminence trusts that "the example may be an incentive to others in the study and understanding of things Oriental." The Holy Father, continues the Cardinal, has nothing more at heart than the return of our dissident brethren of the East to the unity of the Church of Christ. The codification of Eastern Canon Law and the obligations of special study of eastern questions imposed upon universities and seminaries prove the need of understanding and sympathy if we are to labour efficaciously for the welfare of the Christian East. In conclusion, the Cardinal congratulates Dr. Barton on the work of the Society of St. John Chrysostom and on his various publications on the eastern churches and liturgies, and bestows his paternal blessing upon the superiors of St. Edmund's College, the Society of St. John Chrysostom, and all the students.

---

---

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

---

---

mean  
nish  
inst  
arily

the  
azis  
n to  
rian  
g as  
are

linal  
cred  
the  
His  
e to  
cal."  
re at  
st to  
stern  
stern  
the  
effi-  
sion,  
the  
tions  
ernal  
ciety



# THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XIV. No. 3. The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, SS. Cosmas and Damian

July, 1986.

**EDITORIAL.**—Annual General Meeting. Fogeyism. What is Quackery? Medical Missions. ORIGINAL ARTICLES.—The Guild and Guild Membership, by Dr. Ray Edridge. A Glance at Modern Psychology (Part II.), by Revd. J. C. Heenan, Ph.D., D.D. Home or Hospital? A Maternity Problem, by a Public Health Official. Sterilisation from the Scientific and Moral points of view, by Dr. A. Niedermayer, International Congress of Catholic Doctors at Vienna, Whitsuntide, by Dr. Joan Lamplugh. ABORTION, STERILIZATION AND DICHOTOMY. REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTICES.—Father Finney's "Moral Problems," etc., and *The Lancet's* Notice. Dr. Fox on Francis Thompson. *The*

*Catholic Herald*. *The Month*. "The French Bulletin." "The Medical Dictator," by Dr. Major Greenwood. "Masturbation and the Psycho-Sexual Life," by Dr. J. F. W. Meagher. "The Coming of the Monster," by Owen F. Dudley. "The Repeal of the C.D. Act." ACTIVITIES OF OUR MEMBERS. NEWS FROM THE BRANCHES.—London, East Anglia, Brentwood, Nottingham. CARTOON (by Teg). NEWS FROM OVERSEAS.—Holland. OBITUARY.—Dr. Theodore Dillon, Dr. James Kelland, Dr. M. Leahy, Dr. J. D. McPeely. Price: 1s. 4d. Annual Subscription, 5s. 0d. (post free). Subscription for United States \$1.50. Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London; 43, 44, 45, Newgate Street, E.C.1.

## FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1730 LTD.

Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY

## FRAGRANT INCENSE

IN SEVERAL QUALITIES AND CHARCOAL for use with Incense OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephones: SPEEDWELL 6237

Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON



**Chalices  
OSBORNE**  
117, GOWER ST.  
LONDON, W.C.1.  
SEND FOR BOOK 16

## John Hardman's

John T. Hardman Stained Glass 49 Newhall-Hill  
Donald B. Tavenor Birmingham &  
John Hardman Paintings Monies 1, Albemarle  
& Co. Limited Church Decoration St. Piccadilly,  
Private Comm. London, W.

# BLACKFRIARS

BLACKFRIARS is a literary and critical monthly, founded by the late Fr. Bede Jarrett, and edited by English Dominicans at Blackfriars, Oxford.

ITS AIM is to provide an organ of authentic Thomist thought, and to appreciate and criticise the various aspects and problems of modern life in the light of Thomist Theology and Philosophy. It is not a domesticated or purely clerical review; it seeks to provide a distinctively Catholic commentary on all manner of current movements and events, to assist Catholics to form their judgment on tendencies of thought and action in the world around them and to enable non-Catholics to understand and share an intelligent Catholic outlook.

CONTRIBUTORS include many well-known Dominicans, both English and foreign, and celebrated Thomist thinkers such as Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, Eric Gill.

THE SEPTEMBER NUMBER includes DOMINICAN SPIRITUALITY, by Gervase Mathew, O.P.; THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION, by Vincent McNabb, O.P.; PLAIN TALKS ON FUNDAMENTALS; THE NEED FOR DOGMA, by "Praedicator"; THE SIXTH MALINES CONGRESS, by C. van Gestel, O.P.; FIRST PHILOSOPHY, by Norbert Drewitt, O.P.; RELIGIOUS LIFE IN THE WORLD, by Hilary Carpenter, O.P.; ORIGINS OF THE ANGLICAN MINISTRY, by M. J. Congar, O.P.; SAINTS AND SERPENTS, by Walter Gumbley, O.P., F.R.Hist.S.

MONTHLY FEATURES include Editorial, Book Reviews (which PAX has ranked "among the best in any periodical") and "Penguin's" EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS on current periodicals.

BLACKFRIARS may be obtained on ordering from all booksellers, bookstalls, and newsagents, price 1/- a month, or from the Publishers at 1/1d. per copy post free. The annual subscription rate is 12/-.

BLACKFRIARS, 2, Brems Buildings, London, E.C.4.

## NEW AND FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

### **THE ROMAN BREVIARY**

An ENGLISH VERSION compiled by the Benedictine Nuns of Stanbrook. Introduction by Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B.  
In Four volumes 15/- each volume or in Leather at 21/- each volume.

### **WHEREFORE THIS WASTE**

By FATHER JAMES, O.M.Cap.  
Lectures concerning popular devotion to the Liturgy. Cloth. 6/-

### **REASON AND RELIGION**

By DR. ARENDZEN.  
A second volume of Sermons from the *Catholic Times*. Cloth. 5/-

### **MOTHER ARSENIUS OF FOXFORD**

By REV. DENIS GILDEA.  
The life of a modern Irish Sister of Charity, Mother Morrogh-Bernard. Cloth. 6/-

### **OUR FATHER**

By CARDINAL LEPICIER.  
Ten discourses illustrative of the "Our Father." Cloth. 5/-

### **THE PROMISES OF CHRIST**

By MOTHER MARY PHILIP, I.B.V.M.  
Short meditations on each of the promises contained in the New Testament. Cloth. 3/6

### **SOME SISTERS OF MINE**

By SISTER MARIE RENÉ BAZIN.  
Portrait studies of Helpers of the Holy Souls by René Bazin's daughter. The book has been crowned by the French Academy. Cloth. 5/-

### **HISTORIC ENGLISH CONVENTS OF TODAY**

By DOM BASIL WHELAN, O.S.B.  
An account of the principal English Convents, developed from the author's long series of articles in the *Tablet*. Written under the direction of Abbot Butler. Cloth. 8/6

---

## **Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.,**

**43, Newgate St., E.C.1 and 129 Victoria St., S.W.1**

*And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin*

---

Printed in Great Britain by Gibbs & Bamforth Ltd., St. Albans, Herts.



of

e.

/-

/-

d.

/-

/-

w

6

r.

/-

ne

on

6